

Carl A. Rudisill Library



0 1976 0005652 1


CARL A. RUDISILL LIBRARY
LENOIR RHYNE COLLEGE
HICKORY, N. C. 28601

PN
6121
.L6
1902
v 7

14862

DATE DUE			

DISCARDED



THE LIBRARY OF ORATORY

Ancient and Modern

OF CRITICAL STUDIES OF THE
WORLD'S GREAT ORATORS
& EMINENT ESSAYISTS

CHAUNCEY M. DREW, LL.D.

WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE

Photogravure from a Photograph

NATHAN BASKELL DINE

CAROLINE ECKHART

THOMAS CHARLES QUINN

ASSOCIATE MANAGERS

EDITED BY

IN FIFTEEN VOLUMES

VOLUME VII

ILLUSTRATED

FORAMOUNT BY

E. R. DE MONT

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

OWNERS OF THE LIBRARY

THE NEW YORK COLLEGE

NEW YORK, N. Y. 1891

THE LIBRARY OF ORATORY

Ancient and Modern

with CRITICAL STUDIES *of the*
WORLD'S GREAT ORATORS
by EMINENT ESSAYISTS

CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW, LL.D.

United States Senator from the State of New York

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

NATHAN HASKELL DOLE

CAROLINE TICKNOR THOMAS CHARLES QUINN

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Edition de Luxe

IN FIFTEEN VOLUMES

VOLUME VII.

ILLUSTRATED

PUBLISHED BY

E. R. DU MONT

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

CARL A. RUDISILL LIBRARY
LENOIR RHYNE COLLEGE
HICKORY, N. C. 28601

COPYRIGHT, 1902,

BY

J. C. TICHENOR

14862

 PA
 6121
 . L6
 1902
 17

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME VII

	BORN.	PAGE.
VICTOR HUGO	1802	1
On the Centennial of Voltaire's Death		1
On Honoré de Balzac		5
On Capital Punishment		8
LOUIS KOSSUTH	1802	20
Speech in Faneuil Hall.		
Speech at Plymouth.		35
First Speech in New York		43
SIR ALEXANDER COCKBURN	1802	53
On the Greek Difficulty.		
LORD BULWER-LYTTON	1803	72
On the Crimean War.		
RALPH WALDO EMERSON	1803	93
The American Scholar.		
Literary Ethics		117
LORD BEACONSFIELD	1804	139
"Conservatism"		140
On the Berlin Congress		179
RICHARD COBDEN	1804	190
On the Corn Laws.		
JOSEPH HOWE	1804	210
Speech before the International Commercial Convention.		

 Major
 Ryne
 Library
 Conn.

	BORN.	PAGE.
MAZZINI	1805	225
To the Young Men of Italy		
DAVID DUDLEY FIELD	1805	234
An International Code of Arbitration.		
WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON	1805	250
Words of Encouragement to the Oppressed.		
JOHN PARKER HALE	1806	262
Speech on Secession.		
GARIBALDI	1807	270
Last Speech as a Member of the Chamber.		
Speech to his Soldiers		272
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS	1807	275
On the States and the Union.		
JEFFERSON DAVIS	1808	287
On Withdrawal from the Union: Secession-		
ist Opinion.		
Inaugural Address		294
No Divided Flag		298
SALMON PORTLAND CHASE	1808	307
Speech on the Kansas-Nebraska Bill.		
NAPOLEON III.	1808	326
Speech in the National Assembly		327
First Inaugural Address as President		328
Address to the French Legislature		330
HENRY EDWARD MANNING	1808	332
The Triumph of the Church.		
SERGEANT SMITH PRENTISS	1808	349
The New England Address.		
ANDREW JOHNSON	1808	364
Speech at St. Louis.		

TABLE OF CONTENTS


vii

	BORN.	PAGE.
OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES	1809	381
Lecture on the Religious Poetry of the Nine- teenth Century.		
Leave No Verbal Message		388
Tribute to Paul Morphy		394
Address of Welcome		403
JULES FAVRE	1809	409
Speech before the Corps Législatif.		
WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE	1809	420
On Domestic and Foreign Affairs		421
On the Beaconsfield Ministry		458

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

VOLUME VII

	OPP. PAGE
WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE (<i>Photogravure</i>) . . .	<i>Frontispiece</i>
VICTOR HUGO	I
RALPH WALDO EMERSON	93
LORD BEACONSFIELD	139
JEFFERSON DAVIS	287
OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES	381



VICTOR HUGO

VICTOR MARIE HUGO



VICTOR MARIE HUGO, a great French poet, dramatist, novelist, man of letters, and senator, was born at Besançon, France, Feb. 26, 1802, and died at Paris, May 22, 1885. His father, a royalist general and adherent of Napoleon, lived to see his son attain fame, though he died in the service of Louis XVIII in the year 1828. Young Hugo had meanwhile published his "Odes et Ballades" and "Les Orientales," and was about to bring out "Hernani," the drama that launched on his country the fierce contest between the Classicists and Romanticists, to the latter of whom Hugo and his friends joyously belonged. The literary revolution which "Hernani" brought about was speedily followed by the political one, in 1830, in which Hugo was weaned from his adherence to Bourbonism, and identified himself with the popular cause. Though Louis Philippe had in 1845 made him a Peer of France, he continued loyal to republicanism, so much so, indeed, as to suffer banishment under "Napoleon le Petit" in 1852. But literature remained to the last his lodestar, and through all the political storm and stress of the time he plied his pen unintermittently and added to his triumphs such fictional masterpieces as "Notre Dame de Paris," "Les Misérables," "Les Travailleurs de la Mer," "L'Homme qui rit," and "Quatre-vingt-treize," besides much magnificent verse, and some speeches and orations of a high order, such as the two here reproduced.

ON THE CENTENNIAL OF VOLTAIRE'S DEATH

DELIVERED AT PARIS, MAY 30, 1878

ONE hundred years ago to-day a man died! He died immortal, laden with years, with labors, and with the most illustrious and formidable of responsibilities—the responsibility of the human conscience informed and corrected. He departed amid the curses of the past and the blessings of the future—and these are the two superb forms of glory!—dying amid the acclamations of his contemporaries and of posterity, on the one hand, and on the other with the hootings and hatreds bestowed by the implacable past on those who combat it. He was more than a man—he was an epoch! He had done his work; he had fulfilled the mission evidently chosen for him by the Supreme Will, which manifests itself as visibly in the laws

of destiny as in the laws of nature. The eighty-four years he had lived bridge over the interval between the apogee of the Monarchy and the dawn of the Revolution. At his birth, Louis XIV. still reigned; at his death Louis XVI. had already mounted the throne. So that his cradle saw the last rays of the great throne and his coffin the first gleams from the great abyss. . . .

The court was full of festivities; Versailles was radiant; Paris was ignorant; and meanwhile, through religious ferocity, judges killed an old man on the wheel and tore out a child's tongue for a song. Confronted by this frivolous and dismal society, Voltaire alone, sensible of all the forces marshalled against him—court, nobility, finance; that unconscious power, the blind multitude; that terrible magistracy, so oppressive for the subject, so docile for the master, crushing and flattering, kneeling on the people before the king; that clergy, a sinister medley of hypocrisy and fanaticism—Voltaire alone declared war against this coalition of all social iniquities—against that great and formidable world. He accepted battle with it. What was his weapon? That which has the lightness of the wind and the force of a thunderbolt—a pen. With that weapon Voltaire fought, and with that he conquered! Let us salute that memory! He conquered! He waged a splendid warfare—the war of one alone against all—the grand war of mind against matter, of reason against prejudice; a war for the just against the unjust, for the oppressed against the oppressor, the war of goodness, the war of kindness! He had the tenderness of a woman and the anger of a hero. His was a great mind and an immense heart. He conquered the old code, the ancient dogma! He conquered the feudal lord, the Gothic judge, the Roman priest! He bestowed

on the populace the dignity of the people! He taught, pacified, civilized. He fought for Sirven and Montbailly as for Calas and Labarre. Regardless of menaces, insults, persecutions, calumny, exile, he was indefatigable and immovable. He overcame violence by a smile, despotism by sarcasm, infallibility by irony, obstinacy by perseverance, ignorance by truth! I have just uttered the word "smile," and I pause at it! "To smile!" That is Voltaire. Let us repeat it—pacification is the better part of philosophy. In Voltaire the equilibrium was speedily restored. Whatever his just anger, it passed off. The angry Voltaire always gives place to the Voltaire of calmness; and then in that profound eye appears his smile. That smile is wisdom—that smile, I repeat, is Voltaire. It sometimes goes as far as a laugh, but philosophic sadness tempers it. It mocks the strong, it caresses the weak. Disquieting the oppressor, it reassures the oppressed. It becomes raillery against the great; pity for the little! Ah! let that smile sway us, for it had in it the rays of the dawn. It was an illumination for truth, for justice, for goodness, for the worthiness of the useful. It illuminated the inner stronghold of superstition. The hideous things it is salutary to see, he showed. It was a smile, fruitful as well as luminous! The new society, the desire for equality and concession; that beginning of fraternity called tolerance, mutual good will, the just accord of men and right, the recognition of reason as the supreme law, the effacing of prejudices, serenity of soul, the spirit of indulgence and pardon, harmony and peace—behold what has resulted from that grand smile! On the day—undoubtedly close at hand—when the identity of wisdom and clemency will be recognized, when the amnesty is proclaimed, I say it!—yonder in the stars Voltaire will smile.

Between two servants of humanity who appeared at one thousand eight hundred years' interval, there is a mysterious relation. To combat Pharisaism, unmask imposture, overturn tyrannies, usurpations, prejudices, falsehoods, superstitions—to demolish the temple in order to rebuild it—that is to say, to substitute the true for the false, attack the fierce magistracy, the sanguinary priesthood; to scourge the money changers from the sanctuary; to reclaim the heritage of the disinherited; to protect the weak, poor, suffering and crushed; to combat for the persecuted and oppressed—such was the war of Jesus Christ! And what man carried on that war? It was Voltaire! The evangelical work had for its complement the philosophic work; the spirit of mercy commenced, the spirit of tolerance continued, let us say it with a sentiment of profound respect: Jesus wept—Voltaire smiled. From that divine tear and that human smile sprang the mildness of existing civilization.

Alas! the present moment, worthy as it is of admiration and respect, has still its dark side. There are still clouds on the horizon; the tragedy of the peoples is not played out; war still raises its head over this august festival of peace. Princes for two years have persisted in a fatal misunderstanding; their discord is an obstacle to our concord, and they are ill-inspired in condemning us to witness the contrast. This contrast brings us back to Voltaire. Amid these threatening events let us be more peaceful than ever. Let us bow before this great death, this great life, this great living spirit. Let us bend before this venerated sepulchre! Let us ask counsel of him whose life, useful to men, expired a hundred years ago, but whose work is immortal. Let us ask counsel of other mighty thinkers, auxiliaries of this

glorious Voltaire—of Jean Jacques, Diderot, Montesquieu! Let us stop the shedding of human blood. Enough, despots! Barbarism still exists. Let philosophy protest. Let the eighteenth century succor the nineteenth. The philosophers, our predecessors, are the apostles of truth. Let us invoke these illustrious phantoms that, face to face with monarchies thinking of war, they may proclaim the right of man to life, the right of conscience to liberty, the sovereignty of reason, the sacredness of labor, the blessedness of peace! And since night issues from thrones, let light emanate from the tombs.

ON HONORE DE BALZAC

THE man who now goes down into this tomb is one of those to whom public grief pays homage.

In our day all fictions have vanished. The eye is fixed not only on the heads that reign, but on heads that think, and the whole country is moved when one of those heads disappears. To-day we have a people in black because of the death of the man of talent: a nation in mourning for a man of genius.

Gentleman, the name of Balzac will be mingled in the luminous trace our epoch will leave across the future.

Balzac was one of that powerful generation of writers of the nineteenth century who came after Napoleon, as the illustrious Pleiad of the seventeenth century came after Richelieu—as if in the development of civilization there were a law which gives conquerors by the intellect as successors to conquerors by the sword.

Balzac was one of the first among the greatest, one of

the highest among the best. This is not the place to tell all that constituted this splendid and sovereign intelligence. All his books form but one book—a book living, luminous, profound, where one sees coming and going and marching and moving, with I know not what of the formidable and terrible, mixed with the real, all our contemporary civilization—a marvellous book which the poet entitled “a comedy” and which he could have called history; which takes all forms and styles, which surpasses Tacitus and Suetonius; which traverses Beaumarchais and reaches Rabelais—a book which realizes observation and imagination, which lavishes the true, the esoteric, the commonplace, the trivial, the material, and which at times through all realities, swiftly and grandly rent away, allows us all at once a glimpse of a most sombre and tragic ideal. Unknown to himself whether he wished it or not, whether he consented or not, the author of this immense and strange work is one of the strong race of revolutionist writers. Balzac goes straight to the goal. Body to body he seizes modern society; from all he wrests something, from these an illusion, from those a hope; from one a catchword, from another a mask. He ransacked vice, he dissected passion. He searched out and sounded man, soul, heart, entrails, brain—the abyss that each one has within himself. And by grace of his free and vigorous nature; by a privilege of the intellect of our time, which, having seen revolutions face to face, can see more clearly the destiny of humanity and comprehend Providence better—Balzac redeemed himself smiling and severe from those formidable studies which produced melancholy in Moliere and misanthropy in Rousseau.

This is what he has accomplished among us, this is the work which he has left us—a work lofty and solid—a monu-

ment robustly piled in layers of granite, from the height of which hereafter his renown shall shine in splendor. Great men make their own pedestal. the future will be answerable for the statue.

His death stupefied Paris! Only a few months ago he had come back to France. Feeling that he was dying, he wished to see his country again, as one who would embrace his mother on the eve of a distant voyage. His life was short, but full, more filled with deeds than days.

Alas! this powerful worker, never fatigued, this philosopher, this thinker, this poet, this genius, has lived among us that life of storm, of strife, of quarrels and combats, common in all times to all great men. To-day he is at peace. He escapes contention and hatred. On the same day he enters into glory and the tomb. Hereafter beyond the clouds, which are above our heads, he will shine among the stars of his country. All you who are here, are you not tempted to envy him?

Whatever may be our grief in presence of such a loss, let us accept these catastrophes with resignation! Let us accept in it whatever is distressing and severe; it is good perhaps, it is necessary perhaps, in an epoch like ours, that from time to time the great dead shall communicate to spirits, devoured with scepticism and doubt, a religious fervor. Providence knows what it does when it puts the people face to face with the supreme mystery and when it gives them death to reflect on—death which is supreme equality, as it is also supreme liberty. Providence knows what it does, since it is the greatest of all instructors.

There can be but austere and serious thoughts in all hearts when a sublime spirit makes its majestic entrance into another life, when one of those beings who have long

soared above the crowd on the visible wings of genius, spreading all at once other wings which we did not see, plunges swiftly into the unknown.

No, it is not the unknown; no, I have said it on another sad occasion and I shall repeat it to-day; no, it is not night, it is light. It is not the end, it is the beginning! It is not extinction, it is eternity! Is it not true, my hearers, such tombs as this demonstrate immortality? In presence of the illustrious dead, we feel more distinctly the divine destiny of that intelligence which traverses the earth to suffer and to purify itself—which we call man.

ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

IN DEFENCE OF CHARLES HUGO, JUNE 11, 1851¹

GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY,—At the first words spoken by the attorney-general I believed for a moment that he intended to abandon the prosecution, but this illusion was of short duration. After having tried in vain to circumscribe and curtail the argument, the counsel for the prosecution has been drawn by the nature of the subject into disclosures which have opened afresh the question in all its phases, and in spite of him it appears again in all its magnitude.

I do not complain. I proceed immediately to the indict-

¹A poacher of Nièvre, Montcharmant, condemned to death, was carried for execution to the little village where the crime had been committed. The culprit was endowed with great physical strength; the executioner and his assistants were not able to drag him from the fatal cart; the execution was suspended until the arrival of reinforcements. When the minions of the law of blood were in sufficient numbers the prisoner was brought before the horrible machine, lifted from the tumbril, carried upon the unsteady platform, and pushed under the knife. The "Événement" depicted in vivid colors this horrible scene. Its editor, Mr. Charles Hugo, was indicted before the court of assizes under the charge of having failed in respect due the law. The young editor was defended by his father.

ment; but first let us begin by a mutual understanding of a word. Good definitions make good discussions.

This phrase, "respect due to the law," which serves as the basis of the accusation, what is its import? What does it signify? What is its real meaning? Evidently—and the prosecution appeared to me not to be strenuous in maintaining the contrary—it cannot mean to suppress criticism of the laws under pretence of respect due to them

This phrase signifies simply respect for the execution of the law; nothing else. It permits criticism, likewise censure, even severe censure. We see examples every day, even with regard to the constitution, which is superior to the law. This phrase permits the invocation of legislative power for the abolishment of a dangerous law; it permits, in short, the opposition of a moral impediment, but it does not permit the opposition of a material obstacle. Let a law be executed though evil, though unjust, though barbarous; denounce it to the judgment, denounce it to the legislator, but let it be executed; say that it is evil, say that it is unjust, say that it is barbarous, but let it be executed. Criticism, yes,—revolt, no. Behold the true sense, the only sense of the phrase, "respect for the laws."

Otherwise, gentlemen, consider this! In this grave work, the elaboration of the laws; work which embraces two functions—the function of the press which criticises, which counsels, which instructs, and the function of the legislator who decides; in this serious work I say the first function, that of criticism, would be paralyzed, and as a result the second also. The laws would never be criticised and consequently there would be no reason for either their amelioration or reformation. The national legislative assembly would be utterly useless; there would be nothing left save to dissolve

it—but that is not what is desired I suppose. This point elucidated, all ambiguity dissipated regarding the real meaning of the phrase “respect due to the laws,” I enter into the very heart of the question.

Gentlemen of the jury, there is in what might be called the ancient European code, a law which for more than a century all philosophers, all thinkers, all real statesmen have wished to erase from the time-honored book of universal law, a law that Beccaria has declared unrighteous, and that Franklin has declared abominable, without a suit having been brought against either; a law which, bearing particularly upon that portion of the people borne down by poverty and ignorance, is odious to the democracy, but which is not less repellant to intelligent conservatives; a law of which the king, Louis Philippe (whom I never mention save with the respect due to old age, to misfortune, and to a grave in exile), of which Louis Philippe said, “I have detested it all my life”; a law against which M. Broglie has written, a law against which M. Guizot has written; a law whose abrogation was demanded by the chamber of deputies twenty years ago in the month of October, 1830, and which at the same time the parliament of half-civilized Otaheite erased from its statutes; a law which the assembly of Frankfort abolished three years since, and which the constitutional assembly of the Roman Republic two years ago, upon nearly the same day, declared abolished forever upon the motion of Deputy Charles Bonaparte, a law which our assembly of 1848 has maintained only with the most painful indecision and the most intense repugnance; a law for whose abolition there are, at this very hour, two motions before the legislative tribunal; a law, finally, which Tuscany will have no longer, which Rome will have no longer, and which it is time that France should no longer tolerate,—

this law before which the moral sense of the community recoils with ever-increasing misgiving—this law is the death penalty.

Gentlemen, it is this law which is to-day the cause of this suit; it is our adversary. I am sorry for the attorney-general, but I see it behind him.

Very well then, I will admit that for twenty years I have believed, as I have stated in pages that I could read to you, I have believed with M. Léon Fancher, who in 1836 wrote in an article in the "Revue de Paris" thus: "The scaffold no longer appears upon our public squares save at rare intervals, and as a spectacle that justice has shame in giving." I believed, I say, that the guillotine, since one must call it by name, began to understand itself, that it felt itself rebuked and made its decision to abandon the full glare of the Place de Grève with its crowds to be no longer cried in the streets and announced as a spectacle. It began to carry on its operations in the most inconspicuous way possible in the obscurity of the Barrière Saint Jacques, in a deserted spot and without spectators. Apparently it began to hide its head, and I congratulated it on this modesty. Well, gentlemen! I deceived myself, M. Léon Fancher deceived himself. The guillotine has recovered from its false shame. It considers itself, in the parlance of the day, a social institution; and who knows, perhaps, even it dreams of its restoration.

The Barrière Saint Jacques marks its decadence. Perhaps some day we shall see it reappear in the Place de Grève at noonday in presence of the multitude, with its train of executioners, of armed police, of public criers, even under the windows of the Hotel de Ville, from whose heights it was one day, the 24th of February, denounced and disfigured. Meantime it rears itself again. It feels it necessary that

society now so unsettled, in order to become re-established, should return, as is still said, to all its ancient traditions, and it is an ancient tradition. It protests against those bombastic demagogues, called Beccaria, Vico, Filangieri, Montesquieu, Turgot, Franklin, called Louis Philippe, called Broglie and Guizot, who dare believe and say that a machine for the cutting off of heads is not needed in a community which has the Gospel for its guide. Its indignation is roused against these utopian anarchists! and on the morrow of its days the most glaring and the most sanguinary, it desires to be admired! It insists that respect be rendered it, else it declares itself insulted, it brings suit and demands damages! It has had the blood, but that is not enough, it is not content, it desires also fine and imprisonment.

Gentlemen of the jury, the day when this official paper was brought to my house for my son, the warrant for this unjustifiable suit—we see strange things in these days and ought to become accustomed to them—well, I avow it, I was stupefied; I said to myself, What! Have we come to that? Is it possible that by force of repeated encroachments upon good sense, upon reason, upon freedom of thought, upon natural rights we have come to that, where not the material respect is demanded of us,—that is not denied, we accord it,—but the moral respect for those penal laws that affright the conscience, that cause whoever thinks of them to grow pale, that religion has in abhorrence, that dare to be without repeal, knowing that they can be blind; for those laws that dip the finger in human blood to write the commandment “Thou shalt not kill,” for those impious laws that make one lose one’s faith in humanity when they strike the culpable, and that cause one to doubt God when they smite the innocent. No, no, no, we have not come to that,—No!

Since, and for the reason that I am involved, it is well to tell you, gentlemen of the jury, and you will understand how profound must be my emotion, that the real culprit in this affair, if culprit there be, is not my son, it is I! The person really guilty, I insist, is myself. I who for twenty-five years have combatted with all my force laws from which there was no appeal! I who for twenty-five years have defended on every occasion the sanctity of human life, and this crime I, long before and more often than my son, have committed. I denounce myself! I have committed this crime with every aggravating circumstance, with premeditation, with perversity, and without its being a first offence. Yes, I declare it, this old and unwise law of retaliation, this law which requires blood for blood, I have combatted it all my life—all my life, gentlemen of the jury, and as long as I have breath I will combat it, with all my efforts as writer I will combat it and with all my acts and all my votes as legislator; I declare it [here M. Hugo extended his arm toward the crucifix at the end of the hall over the judge's seat] before that victim of the death penalty who is there, who sees us and who hears us! I swear it before that cross where, two thousand years ago, as an everlasting testimony for generations to come, human law nailed the Law Divine.

That which my son has written he has written, I repeat, because it is I who have animated him from his childhood, because he is not only my son according to the flesh, but according to the spirit, because he desires to perpetuate the opinion of his father. Perpetuate the opinion of his father! Truly a strange crime and for which I marvel that one should be prosecuted! It was reserved for these unique upholders of the family to show us this novelty.

Gentlemen, I admit that the accusation before us astounds

me. What! A law that may be baleful, that may give to the populace exhibitions immoral, dangerous, degrading, barbarous; that will tend to make the people cruel and at certain times will have appalling effects, and to point out the direful results of this law will be forbidden! And to do this will be called lack of respect for it! And one will be held accountable before the courts! And then will be so much fine and so much imprisonment! Why then, very well! Let us close the chamber of deputies, let us close the schools, let us call our land Mongolia or Thibet, we are no longer a civilized nation! Yes, it will be more easily done, let us say we are in Asia, let us say that there was formerly a country called France but that it no longer exists, and that it has been replaced by something which is no longer a monarchy, I confess, but which certainly is not a republic. Let us see, let us apply the facts, let us get at the real meaning of the phraseology of the accusation.

Gentlemen of the jury, in Spain the inquisition was the law! Well, it must be admitted that there was a lack of respect for the inquisition! In France the rack has been the law! It must be said again that there has been a lack of respect for the rack. To cut off the hands has been the law—there has been a lack of respect—I have lacked in respect—for the axe. To brand has been the law; there has been a lack of respect for the red-hot iron. The guillotine is the law! Well, it is true, I admit it, there is a lack of respect for the guillotine. Do you know why, Monsieur the Attorney-General? It is because of the general desire to hurl the guillotine into that gulf of execration where have already fallen, amid the applause of the human race, the branding iron, the axe, the rack, and the inquisition. It is because of the desire to expel from the august and enlightened sanctuary of jus-

tice that sinister figure which suffices to fill it with horror and gloom—the executioner. Ah! and it is because we desire this that we are social agitators! Yes, it is true we are dangerous men; we wish to suppress the guillotine. It is monstrous!

Gentlemen of the jury, you are the sovereign citizens of a free country, and without changing the nature of this discussion one can, one must speak to you as politicians. Well, then, reflect, and since we are passing through a season of revolution, draw conclusions from what I am about to say to you. If Louis XVI had abolished the death penalty as he had abolished the rack, his head would not have fallen; '93 would have been freed from the headsman's axe; there would have been one bloody page the less in history; that mournful date, the 21st of January, would not exist. Who, then, in the face of the public conscience, in the face of France, in the face of the civilized world, would have dared raise the scaffold for the king, for the man of whom one could say, "It is he who has overthrown it!" The editor of the "*Événement*" is accused of having failed in respect toward the laws; of having failed in respect to capital punishment.

Gentlemen, let us rise a little above mere controversy, let us rise to what forms the basis of all legislation, to the conscience of man. When Servan—who was nevertheless attorney-general—when Servan imprinted upon the criminal laws of his time this memorable stigma, "Our penal laws open every egress to the accuser, and close almost all to the accused;" when Voltaire thus designated the judges of Calais, "Do not talk to me of those judges—half monkeys and half tigers;" when Chateaubriand in the "*Conservateur*" called the law of the double vote "stupid and culpable;"

when Royer-Collard in full session of the Chamber of Deputies, *apropos* of I do not remember what law of censure, hurled out the famous cry, "If you make this law I swear to disobey it,"—when these legislators, when these magistrates, when these philosophers, when these great souls, when these men, some illustrious, and some venerable, spoke thus, what were they doing? Did they lack respect for a law local and temporary? It is possible; the attorney-general asserts it. I do not know; but that which I do know is that they were holy echoes of the law of laws, of universal conscience. Did they offend against justice, the justice of their time, justice transitory and fallible? I do not know, but I know that they proclaimed justice eternal. It is true that one has had the grace to tell us, even in the bosom of the National Assembly, that the atheist Voltaire, the immoral Molière, the obscene La Fontaine, the demagogue Jean Jacques Rousseau, should be indicted. There you see what is thought! There you see what is avowed! There is where we stand!

Gentlemen of the jury, this right to criticise the law, to criticise it even with severity, particularly penal law, that can so easily take on the impress of barbarism, this right of criticism that stands side by side with the duty of amelioration, as a torch to guide a workman, this right of author not less sacred than the right of legislator, this imperative right, this inalienable right, you will recognize in your verdict,—you will acquit the accused. But the counsel for the prosecution, and this is his second argument, asserts that the criticism of the "Événement" went too far, was too scathing. Ah, gentlemen of the jury, let us bring near the event which was the cause of the pretended crime with which one has had the hardihood to charge the editor of the "Événement," let us regard it at short range. Here is a man, condemned,

wretched, who is dragged on a certain morning into one of our squares—there he finds a scaffold. He rebels, he pleads, he will not die; he is still young, hardly twenty-nine years old—great heavens! I know what you will say—“He is an assassin!” But listen! Two executioners seize him; his hands are bound, his feet fettered, still he pushes them back. A horrible struggle ensues. He twists his feet in the ladder, and uses the scaffold against the scaffold. The struggle is prolonged, horror takes possession of the crowd. The executioners, the sweat of shame on their brows, pale, breathless, terrified, desperate with I know not what terrible despair—borne down by the weight of public reprobation that must confine itself to condemnation of the death penalty, but that would do wrong in harming its passive instrument—the headsmen—the executioners make savage efforts. Force must remain with the law, that is the maxim! The man clings to the scaffold and demands mercy; his clothing is torn away, his bare shoulders are bloody, he resists all the while. At last, after three quarters of an hour—[here the attorney-general makes a sign of negation] the minutes are disputed, thirty-five minutes, if you prefer—of this awful contest, of this spectacle without a name, of this agony, agony for every one,—do you realize it?—agony for those present as well as for the condemned; after this age of anguish, gentlemen of the jury, the poor wretch is carried back to prison. The people breathe again; the people who have the humane feelings of earlier times, and who are merciful, knowing themselves to be sovereign—the people believe him to be saved. Not at all. The guillotine is vanquished, but still rears itself; it remains standing throughout the day in the midst of a population filled with consternation. At night the executioners, reinforced in number, bind the man in such fashion that

he is no longer anything save an inert mass, and again transport him to the square, weeping, screaming, haggard, bleeding, begging for life, calling upon God, calling upon his father and his mother, because in the face of death this man is again a child. He is hoisted upon the scaffold—and his head falls! And then a murmur of abhorrence is heard from the crowd; never has legal murder appeared more presumptuous or more accursed; every one feels, so to speak, jointly responsible for the tragic deed just done; every one feels in his inmost soul as if he had seen in the very midst of France, in broad day, civilization insulted by barbarism! Then it is that a cry breaks forth from the breast of a young man, from his heart, from his soul, from the very depths of his being, a cry of pity, a cry of anguish, a cry of horror; and for this cry you will punish him! And, in presence of these frightful facts that I have brought under your notice, you will say to the guillotine, “Thou art right!” and will say to compassion, to holy compassion, “Thou art wrong!”

Monsieur the Attorney-General, I tell you without bitterness that you are not defending a righteous cause. It is in vain! You are engaging in an unequal contest with the spirit of civilization, with milder manners, with progress. You have against you the resistance of the inmost heart of man; you have against you all the principles in the light of which for sixty years France has walked and also caused the world to walk—the inviolability of human life, the brotherhood of the ignorant classes, and the doctrine of amelioration in place of the doctrine of retaliation.

You have against you all that illuminates reason, all that vibrates in the soul, philosophy as well as religion; on the one side Voltaire, on the other Jesus Christ. Your labor is in vain, this frightful service that the scaffold has the preten-

sion to render society, society abhors and rejects. Your labor is in vain, the upholders of capital punishment labor in vain, and you see we do not confound them with society, it is useless for them, they will never take away the guilt of the old law of retaliation. They will never wash away those hideous words upon which for so many centuries has trickled down the blood from heads severed by the executioner's knife.

Gentlemen, I have done!

My son, you are to-day in receipt of a great honor, you have been adjudged worthy to contend, perhaps to suffer, for the holy cause of truth. From to-day you enter into the real vital life of our time, that is to say, the struggle for justice and truth. Be proud, you who are but a common soldier of humanity and democracy, you are sitting where Béranger has been seated, where Lamennais has sat.

Remain immovable in your convictions, and, though it were to be my last word, if you have need of a thought to strengthen your faith in progress, your belief in the future, your devotion to humanity, your execration of the scaffold, your loathing for all penalties irrevocable and irreparable, remember that before this very bar Lesurques also was arraigned.

[Specially translated by Mary Emerson Adams.]

LOUIS KOSSUTH



LOUIS KOSSUTH, Hungarian patriot and orator, was born at Monok, Hungary, April 27, 1802, and died at Turin, Italy, March 20, 1894. He received a good education, and in 1832 entered the Hungarian Diet, where he served for four years. Imprisoned by the Austrian government in 1837, on account of his liberal opinions, he was released three years later, and soon afterward became editor of the "Pesth Journal." In 1847, he was once more chosen Deputy to the Diet, and it was largely owing to his efforts that Austria, in 1813, found herself constrained to concede a measure of autonomy to Hungary. In the following year, when the perfidy of the imperial government drove the Magyars to insurrection, Kossuth became President of the Hungarian Republic. After the overthrow of the Magyar commonwealth by the combined forces of Austria and Russia, Kossuth fled to Turkey, where he sojourned for a time, when he visited England and the United States, in the hope of securing the coöperation of those countries in his endeavor to restore Hungarian independence. The speeches delivered by him in the United States in 1852 excited some enthusiasm. After the battle of Sudowa, he lived to see his native land acquire almost complete autonomy, and even exercise ascendancy in the councils of the House of Hapsburg-Lorraine, but he refused to acquiesce in Austrian rule, even when it had become merely nominal. His memoirs and letters during his exile, together with selections from his speeches delivered in England during the Russian war, have been published in various languages.

SPEECH IN FANEUIL HALL

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—Do me the justice to believe that I rise not with any pretension to eloquence, within the Cradle of American Liberty. If I were standing upon the ruins of Prytaneum and had to speak whence Demosthenes spoke, my tongue would refuse to obey, my words would die away upon my lips, and I would listen to the winds, fraught with the dreadful realization of his unheeded prophecies.

My tongue is fraught with a downtrodden nation's wrongs.

The justice of my cause is my eloquence; but misfortune may approach the altar whence the flame arose which roused your fathers from degradation to independence. I claim my people's share in the benefit of the laws of nature and of nature's God. I will nothing add to the historical reputation of these walls; but I dare hope not to sully them by appealing to those maxims of truth, the promulgation of which made often tremble these walls, from the thundering cheers of freemen roused by the clarion sound of inspired oratory.

"Cradle of American Liberty!"—it is a great name; but there is something in it which saddens my heart. You should not say "American liberty." You should say "Liberty in America." Liberty should not be either American or European,—it should be just "Liberty." God is God. He is neither America's God nor Europe's God; he is God. So should liberty be. "American liberty" has much the sound as if you would say "American privilege." And there is the rub. Look to history, and when your heart saddens at the fact that liberty never yet was lasting in any corner of the world and in any age, you will find the key of it in the gloomy truth that all who yet were free regarded liberty as their privilege instead of regarding it as a principle. The nature of every privilege is exclusiveness; that of a principle is communicative. Liberty is a principle,—its community is its security,—exclusiveness is its doom.

What is aristocracy? It is exclusive liberty; it is privilege; and aristocracy is doomed because it is contrary to the destiny and welfare of man. Aristocracy should vanish, not in the nations but also from amongst the nations. So long as that is not done liberty will nowhere be lasting on earth. It is equally fatal to individuals as to nations to believe themselves beyond the reach of vicissitudes. To this proud reliance, and

the isolation resulting therefrom, more victims have fallen than to oppression by immediate adversities. You have prodigiously grown by your freedom of seventy-five years; but what is seventy-five years to take for a charter of immortality? No, no! my humble tongue tells the records of eternal truth. A privilege never can be lasting. Liberty restricted to one nation never can be sure. You may say, "We are the prophets of God;" but you shall not say "God is only our God." The Jews have said so, and the pride of Jerusalem lies in the dust. Our Saviour taught all humanity to say "Our Father in heaven;" and his Jerusalem is lasting to the end of days.

"There is a community in man's destiny." That was the greeting which I read on the arch of welcome on the Capitol Hill of Massachusetts. I pray to God the republic of America would weigh the eternal truth of those words and act accordingly. Liberty in America would then be sure to the end of time. But if you say "American liberty," and take that grammar for your policy, I dare say the time will yet come when humanity will have to mourn over a new proof of the ancient truth, that without community national freedom is never sure. You should change "American liberty" into "Liberty,"—then liberty would be forever sure in America, and that which found a cradle in Faneuil Hall never would find a coffin through all coming days. I like not the word cradle connected with the word liberty,—it has a scent of mortality. But these are vain words, I know; though in the life of nations the spirits of future be marching in present events, visible to every reflecting mind, still those who foretell them are charged with arrogantly claiming the title of prophets, and prophecies are never believed. However, the cradle of American liberty is not only famous from the reputa-

tion of having been always the lists of the most powerful eloquence; it is still more conspicuous for having seen that eloquence attended by practical success. To understand the mystery of this rare circumstance a man must see the people of New England and especially the people of Massachusetts.

In what I have seen of New England there are two things the evidence of which strikes the observer at every step—prosperity and intelligence. I have seen thousands assembled, following the noble impulses of generous hearts; almost the entire population of every city, of every town, of every village, where I passed, gathered around me, throwing the flowers of consolation in my thorny way. I can say I have seen the people here, and I have looked at it with a keen eye, sharpened in the school of a toilsome life. Well, I have seen not a single man bearing the mark of that poverty upon himself which in old Europe strikes the eye sadly at every step. I have seen no ragged poor; I have seen not a single house bearing the appearance of desolated poverty. The cheerfulness of a comfortable condition, the result of industry, spreads over the land. One sees at a glance that the people work assiduously,—not with the depressing thought just to get from day to day, by hard toil, through the cares of a miserable life, but they work with the cheerful consciousness of substantial happiness. And the second thing which I could not fail to remark is the stamp of intelligence impressed upon the very eyes and outward appearance of the people at large. I and my companions have seen that people in the factories, in the workshops, in their houses, and in the streets, and could not fail a thousand times to think “how intelligent that people looks.” It is to such a people that the orators of Faneuil Hall had to speak, and therein is the mystery of their success. They were not wiser than the public spirit of their audience,

but they were the eloquent interpreters of the people's enlightened instinct.

No man can force the harp of his own individuality into the people's heart; but every man may play upon the chords of his people's heart, who draws his inspiration from the people's instinct. Well, I thank God for having seen the public spirit of the people of Massachusetts bestowing its attention to the cause I plead and pronouncing its verdict. After the spontaneous manifestations of public opinion which I have met in Massachusetts, there can be not the slightest doubt that his Excellency the high-minded Governor of Massachusetts, when he wrote his memorable address to the legislature,—the joint committee of the legislative assembly, after a careful and candid consideration of the subject, not only concurring in the views of the executive government, but elucidating them in a report the irrefutable logic and elevated statesmanship of which will forever endear the name of Hazewell to oppressed nations; and the senate of Massachusetts adopting the resolutions proposed by the legislative committee, in respect to the question of national intervention,—I say the spontaneous manifestation of public opinion leaves not the slightest doubt that all these executive and legislative proceedings not only met the full approbation of the people of Massachusetts, but were in fact nothing else but the solemn interpretation of that public opinion of the people of Massachusetts. A spontaneous outburst of popular sentiments tells often more in a single word than all the skill of elaborate eloquence could. I have met that word. "We worship not the man but we worship the principle," shouted out a man in Worcester, amidst the thundering cheers of a countless multitude. It was a word like those words of flame spoken in Faneuil Hall out of which liberty in America was born.

That word is a revelation that the spirit of eternal truth and of present exigencies moves through the people's heart. That word is teeming with the destinies of America.

Would to God that in the leading quarters small party considerations should never prevent the due appreciation of the people's instinctive sagacity! It is with joyful consolation and heartfelt gratitude I own that of that fear I am forever relieved in respect to Massachusetts. Once more I have met the revelation of the truth that the people of Massachusetts worship principles. I have met it on the front of your Capitol, in those words raised to the consolation of the oppressed world, by the constitutional authorities of Massachusetts, to the high heaven, upon an arch of triumph,—“Remember that there is a community in mankind's destiny.”

I cannot express the emotion I felt when, standing on the steps of your Capitol, these words above my head, the people of Massachusetts tendered me its hand in the person of its chief magistrate. The emotion which thrilled through my heart was something like that Lazarus must have felt when the Saviour spoke to him “Rise;” and when I looked up with a tender tear of heartfelt gratitude in my eyes, I saw the motto of Massachusetts all along the Capitol, “We seek with the sword the mild quietness of liberty.”

You have proved this motto not to be an empty word. The heroic truth of it is recorded in the annals of Faneuil Hall, it is recorded on Bunker Hill, recorded in the Declaration of Independence.

Having read that motto, coupled with the acknowledgment of the principle that there is a community in the destiny of all humanity, I know what answer I have to take to those millions who look with profound anxiety to America.

Gentlemen, the Mahometans say that the city of Bokhara

receives not light from without, but is lustrous with its own light. I don't know much about Bokhara; but so much I know, that Boston is the sun whence radiated the light of resistance against oppression. And from what it has been my good fortune to experience in Boston I have full reason to believe that the sun which shone forth with such a bright lustre in the days of oppression has not lost its lustre by freedom and prosperity. Boston is the metropolis of Massachusetts, and Massachusetts has given its vote. It has given it after having, with the penetrating sagacity of its intelligence, looked attentively into the subject and fixed with calm consideration its judgment thereabout. After having had so much to speak, it was with infinite gratification I heard myself addressed in Brookfield, Framingham, and several other places, with these words, "We know your country's history; we agree with your principles; we want no speech; just let us hear your voice, and then go on; we trust and wish you may have other things to do than speak."

Thus having neither to tell my country's tale, because it is known, nor having to argue about principles, because they are agreed with, I am in the happy condition of being able to restrain myself to a few desultory remarks about the nature of the difficulties I have to contend with in other quarters, that the people of Massachusetts may see upon what ground those stand who are following a direction contrary to the distinctly pronounced opinion of Massachusetts in relation to the cause I plead.

Give me leave to mention that, having had an opportunity to converse with leading men of the great political parties, which are on the eve of an animated contest for the presidency,—would it had been possible for me to have come to America either before that contest was engaged, or after it

will be decided! I came, unhappily, in a bad hour,—I availed myself of that opportunity to be informed about what are considered to be the principal issues in case the one or the other party carries the prize; and, indeed, having got the information thereof, I could not forbear to exclaim, “But, my God! all these questions together cannot outweigh the all-overruling importance of foreign policy!” It is there, in the question of foreign policy, that the heart of the next future throbs. Security and danger, developing prosperity, and its check, peace and war, tranquillity and embarrassment,—yes, life and death will be weighed in the scale of foreign policy! It is evident things are come to the point where they have been in ancient Rome, when old Cato never spoke privately or publicly about whatever topic without closing his speech with these words: “However, my opinion is that Carthage must be destroyed;” thus advertising his countrymen that there was one question outweighing in importance all other questions, from which public attention should never for a moment be withdrawn.

Such, in my opinion, is the condition of the world now. Carthage and Rome had no place on earth together. Republican America and all-overwhelming Russian absolutism cannot much longer subsist together on earth. Russia active,—America passive,—there is an immense danger in that fact; it is like the avalanche in the Alps which the noise of a bird’s wing may move and thrust down with irresistible force, growing every moment. I cannot but believe it were highly time to do as old Cato did and finish every speech with these words: “However, the law of nations should be maintained and absolutism not permitted to become omnipotent.”

I could not forbear to make these remarks; and the answer I got was, “That is all true, and all right, and will be attended

to when the election is over; but, after all, the party must come into power, and you know there are so many considerations,—men want to be managed, and even prejudices spared, and so forth.”

And it is true; but it is sorrowful that it is true. That reminds me of what, in Schiller’s “Maria Stuart,” Mortimer says to Lord Leicester, the all-mighty favorite of Elizabeth: “O God, what little steps has such a great lord to go at this court!” There is the first obstacle I have to meet with. This consolation, at least, I have, that the chief difficulty I have to contend with is neither lasting nor an argument against the justice of my cause or against the righteousness of my principles. Just as the calumnies by which I am assailed can but harm my own self but cannot impair the justice of my country’s cause or weaken the propriety of my principles,—so that difficulty, being just a difficulty and no argument, cannot change the public opinion of the people, which always cares more about principles than about wire-pullings.

The second difficulty I have to contend with is rather curious. Many a man has told me that if I had only not fallen into the hands of the Abolitionists and Free-Soilers he would have supported me; and had I landed somewhere in the South, instead of New York, I would have met quite different things from that quarter; but being supported by the Free-Soilers, of course I must be opposed by the South. On the other side, I received a letter from which I beg leave to quote a few lines:

“You are silent on the subject of slavery. Surrounded as you have been by slaveholders ever since you put your foot on English soil, if not during your whole voyage from Constantinople,—and ever since you have been in this country

surrounded by them, whose threats, promises, and flattery make the stoutest hearts succumb,—your position has put me in mind of a scene described by the apostle of Jesus Christ, when the devil took him up into a high mountain.”

Now, gentlemen, thus being charged from one side with being in the hands of Abolitionists, and from the other side with being in the hands of the slaveholders, I indeed am at a loss what course to take, if these very contradictory charges were not giving me the satisfaction to feel that I stand just where it is my duty to stand, on a truly American ground.

I must beg leave to say a few words in that respect, the more because I could not escape vehement attacks for not committing myself even in that respect with whatever interior party question. I claim the right for my people to regulate its own domestic concerns. I claim this as a law of nations, common to all humanity; and because common to all I claim to see them protected by the United States, not only because they have the power to defend what despots dare offend, but also because it is the necessity of their position to be a power on earth, which they would not be if the law of nations can be changed and the general condition of the world altered without their vote. Now, that being my position and my cause, it would be the most absurd inconsistency if I would offend that principle which I claim and which I advocate.

And O, my God, have I not enough sorrows and cares to bear on these poor shoulders? Is it not astonishing that the moral power of duties and the iron will of my heart sustain yet this shattered frame; that I am desired yet to take up additional cares? If the cause I plead be just, if it be worthy of your sympathy, and at the same time consistent with the impartial considerations of your own moral and material interests,—which a patriot never should disregard, not even out

of philanthropy,—then why not weigh that cause with the scale of its own value and not with a foreign one? Have I not difficulties enough to contend with that I am desired to increase them yet with my own hands? Father Mathew goes on preaching temperance, and he may be opposed or supported on his own ground; but whoever imagined opposition to him because at the same time he takes not into his hands to preach fortitude or charity? And indeed to oppose or to abandon the cause I plead, only because I mix not with the agitation of an interior question, is a greater injustice yet, because to discuss the question of foreign policy I have a right. My nation is an object of that policy; we are interested in it; but to mix with interior party movements I have no right, not being a citizen of the United States.

The third difficulty which I meet, so far as I am told, is the opposition of the commercial interest. I have the agreeable duty to say that this opposition, or rather indifference, is only partial. I have met several testimonials of the most generous sympathy from gentlemen of commerce. But if, upon the whole, it should be really true that there is more coolness, or even opposition, in that quarter than in others, then I may say that there is an entire misapprehension of the true commercial interests in it. I could say that it would be strange to see commerce, and chiefly the commerce of a republic, indifferent to the spread of liberal institutions. That would be a sad experience, teeming with incalculable misfortunes, reserved to the nineteenth century. Until now history has recorded that “commerce has been the most powerful locomotive of principles and the most fruitful ally of civilization, intelligence, and of liberty.” It was merchants whose names are shining with immortal lustre from the most glorious pages of the golden books of Venice, Genoa, etc. Com-

merce, republican commerce, raised single cities to the position of mighty powers on earth and maintained them in that proud position for centuries; and surely it was neither indifference nor opposition to republican principles by which they have thus ennobled the history of commerce and of humanity. I know full well that since the treasures of commerce took their way into the coffers of despotism, in the shape of eternal loans, and capital began to speculate upon the oppression of nations, a great change has occurred in that respect.

But, thanks to God, the commerce of America is not engaged in that direction, hated by millions, cursed by humanity! Her commerce is still what it was in former times, the beneficent instrumentality of making mankind partake of all the fruits and comforts of the earth and of human industry. Here it is no paper speculation upon the changes of despotism; and, therefore, if the commercial interests of republican America are considered with that foresighted sagacity without which there is no future and no security in them, I feel entirely sure that no particular interest can be more ambitious to see absolutism checked and freedom and democratic institutions developed in Europe than the commerce of republican America. It is no question of more or less profit; it is a question of life and death to it. Commerce is the heel of Achilles, the vulnerable point of America. Thither will, thither must be aimed the first blow of victorious absolutism; the instinct of self-preservation would lead absolutism to strike that blow if its hatred and indignation would not lead to it. Air is not more indispensable to life than freedom and constitutional government in Europe to the commerce of America.

Though many things which I have seen have upon calm

reflection induced me to raise an humble word of warning against materialism, still I believe there was more patriotic solicitude than reality in the fact that Washington and John Adams, at the head of the war department, complained of a predominating materialism (they styled it avarice), which threatened the ruin of America. I believe that complaint would even to-day not be more founded than it was in the infant age of your republic; still, if there be any motive for that complaint of your purest and best patriots,—if the commerce of America would know, indeed, no better guiding star than only the momentary profit of a cargo just floating over the Atlantic,—I would be even then at a loss how else to account for the indifference of the commerce of America in the cause of European liberty than by assuming that it is believed the present degraded condition of Europe may endure, if only the popular agitations are deprived of material means to disturb that which is satirically called tranquillity.

But such a supposition would, indeed, be the most obnoxious, the most dangerous fallacy. As the old philosopher, being questioned how he could prove the existence of God, answered, “by opening the eyes;” just so, nothing is necessary but to open the eyes in order that men of the most ordinary common sense become aware of it, that the present condition of Europe is too unnatural, too contrary to the vital interests of the countless millions to endure even for a short time. A crisis is inevitable; no individual influence can check it; no indifference or opposition can prevent it. Even men like myself, concentrating the expectations and confidence of oppressed millions in themselves, have only just enough power, if provided with the requisite means, to keep the current in a sound direction, so that in its inevitable eruption it may not become dangerous to social order, which is

indispensable to the security of person and property, without which especially no commerce has any future at all. And that being the unsophisticated condition of the world, and a crisis being inevitable, I indeed cannot imagine how those who desire nothing but peace and tranquillity can withhold their helping hands, that the inevitable crisis should not only be kept in a sound direction, but also carried down to a happy issue, capable to prevent the world from boiling continually like a volcano, and insuring a lasting peace and a lasting tranquillity, never possible so long as the great majority of nations are oppressed, but sure so soon as the nations are content,—and content they can only be when they are free.

Indeed, if reasonable logic has not yet forsaken the world, it is the men of peace, it is the men of commerce, to the support of whom I have a right to look. Others may support my cause out of generosity,—these must support me out of considerate interest; others may oppose me out of egotism,—American commerce, in opposing me, would commit suicide.

Gentlemen, of such narrow nature are the considerations which oppose my cause. Of equally narrow, inconsistent scope are all the rest, with the enumeration of which I will not abuse your kind indulgence. Compare with them the broad basis of lofty principles upon which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts took its stand in bestowing the important benefit of its support to my cause; and you cannot forbear to feel proudly that the spirit of old Massachusetts is still alive, entitled to claim that right in the councils of the united Republic which it had in the glorious days when, amidst dangers, wavering resolutions, and partial despondency, Massachusetts took boldly the lead to freedom and independence.

Those men of immortal memory, who within these very

walls lighted with the heavenly spark of their inspiration the torch of freedom in America, avowed for their object the welfare of mankind; and when you raised the monument of Bunker Hill it was the genius of freedom thrilling through the heart of Massachusetts which made one of your distinguished orators say that the days of your ancient glory will continue to rain influence on the destinies of mankind to the end of time. It is upon this inspiration I rely, in the name of my down-trodden country,—to-day the martyr of mankind, to-morrow the battlefield of its destiny.

Time draws nigh when either the influence of Americans must be felt throughout the world, or the position abandoned to which you rose with gigantic vitality out of the blood of your martyrs.

I have seen the genius of those glorious days spreading its fiery wings of inspiration over the people of Massachusetts. I feel the spirit of olden times moving through Faneuil Hall. Let me cut short my stammering words; let me leave your hearts alone with the inspiration of history; let me bear with me the heart-strengthening conviction that I have seen Boston still a radiating sun, as it was of yore, but risen so high on mankind's sky as to spread its warming rays of elevated patriotism far over the waves. American patriotism of to-day is philanthropy for the world.

Gentlemen, I trust in God, I trust in the destinies of humanity, and intrust the hopes of oppressed Europe to the consistent energy of Massachusetts.

SPEECH AT PLYMOUTH

GENTLEMEN,—It is said that a poor little bird, having a grain of seed in his bill, was wafted by the current of the gale over the waves to a new part of globe, a barren desert yet, lately risen from the hidden depth where the mysterious work of creation is still going on. The grain of seed fell from the bill of the bird, and out of that grain a new creation was born. An ocean of haulm, the children of that solitary grain, undulates over the blooming prairie, bowing in adoration before Nature's God; and millions of flowers send the sacrifice of their fragrance up to the Almighty's throne.

If I had to stand on the spot where that grain of seed fell from the beak of the bird, with the blooming prairie spreading before my eyes, boundless like eternity, I could not feel more awe than here, on this hallowed spot, the most striking evidence of the most wonderful operation of Divine Providence.

Every object which meets my eye, the very echo of my steps, is fraught with the most wonderful tale which ever found its way to the heart of men.

You all,—you are wont to stand on this spot; you are wont to walk on this hallowed ground; the ocean's breeze which your ears catch, to you it is not fraught with woful sighs from a bleeding home; and still I see the lustre of religious awe in your eyes, and I hear your hearts throb with uncommon emotion of pious sentiments. What, then, must I feel on this spot? What must I hear in the voice of the breeze, where the spirits of departed pilgrims melt their whispers with the sighs of my oppressed fatherland?

I am not here, gentlemen, to retell the Pilgrim Fathers' tale: I have to learn about it from your particulars, which historians neglect, but the people's heart by pious tradition likes to conserve. Neither am I here to tell how happy you are,—that, you feel. Pointed by that sentiment which instinctively rises in the heart of happy, good men at the view of foreign misfortune, you invited me to this sacred spot, desiring to pour in my sad heart the consoling inspiration flowing from this place and to strengthen me in the trust to God. I thank you for it; it does good to my heart. The very air which I here respire, though to me sad, because fresh with the sorrows of Europe and with the woes of my native land, that very air is a balm to the bleeding wounds of my soul; it relieves like as the tears relieve the oppressed heart.

But this spot is a book of history. A book not written by man, but by the Almighty himself,—a leaf out of the records of destiny, sent to earth and illumined by the light of heavenly intellect, that men and nations, reading in that book of life the bountiful intentions of the Almighty God, may learn the duties they are expected to fulfil, and cannot neglect to fulfil without offending those intentions with which the Almighty ruler of human destinies has worked the wonders of which Plymouth Rock is the cradle-place.

I feel like Moses when he stood on Mount Nebo, in the mountains of Abarim, looking over the billows. I see afar the Canaan of mankind's liberty. I would the people of your great republic would look to Plymouth Rock as to a new Sinai, where the Almighty legislator revealed what he expects your nation to do and not do unto her neighbors, by revealing to her free America's destiny.

Who would have thought, gentlemen, that the modest vessel

which two hundred and thirty-two years ago landed the handful of Pilgrims on Plymouth Rock was fraught with the palladium of liberty, and with the elements of a power destined to regenerate the world?

Oppression drove them from their ancient European home to the wilderness of an unknown world; the "Mayflower" developed into a wonderful tree of liberty. Where the wilderness stood, there now a mighty Christian nation stands, unequalled in general intelligence and in general prosperity, a glorious evidence of mankind's capacity to self-government; and ye, happy sons of those Pilgrim Fathers, it became your glorious destiny to send back an enchanted twig from your tree of freedom to the Old World, thus requiting the oppression which drove away your forefathers from it. Is the time come for it? Yes, it is. That which is a benefit to the world is a condition of your own security.

While the tree of freedom which the Pilgrims planted grew so high that one twig of it may revive a world, in Europe, by a strange contradiction, another tree has grown in the same time,—the tree of evil and of despotism. It is Russia. Both have grown so large that there is no place more for them both on earth. One must be lopped, that the other may still spread.

And while the tree of good here and the tree of evil there have thus grown, my nation, a handful of braves, a foreign race from far Asia, transplanted to Europe a thousand years ago,—not kindred to you, not kindred to any European race, but guarding in its bosom, through all vicissitudes of time, a spark from that fire which led your Pilgrim Fathers to America's shores,—my nation stood in the very neighborhood of the tree of evil, a modest shrub, bearing up through centuries against the blasting winds encroaching upon the fields

of Christianity and of Christian civilization. Beaten continually by these blasting winds, it could not grow; but it stood firmly in its place and checked their course. It was the emblem of resistance.

The wind has shifted. Russian despotism threatens the Christian world, and it is again the shrub of my nation which has to check the gale. O, dear shrub of my dear native land! thy leaves are yellow and thy branches are torn; but the roots still hold firm, and the stock of the people is sound, and the soil which nursed that shrub for a thousand years is still full of life. Undaunted courage, unflinching resolution, undiminished confidence, nurses the roots.

Now, what is it I claim from you, people of America—ye powerful swarm from the beehive Europe, ye sons of the Pilgrims,—those Christian Deucalions, who peopled this New World, and founded a nation in seeking but the asylum of a new home?

What is it I claim from you, people of America? Is it that you should send over yonder Atlantic a fleet of new Mayflowers, manned with thousands of Miles Standishes? Claim I the sword of that brave chieftain, as the people of Weymouth, the Wessagusens of old, claimed it once from the Pilgrim Fathers, that, as he once did for them, you may do for my people, brandishing its brave "Damascus blade" against the Indians of despotism, more dangerous to mankind's liberty—that common property of which you have the fairest share—than in those olden times the Indians of Cape Cod have been dangerous to the handful of Pilgrims, reduced by sickness to half their number, that they may multiply into millions? Is it that which I claim, in the name of mankind's great family, of which you are a mighty, full-grown son? No, I claim not this.

Do I claim from you to send over your sons to Hungary's border mountains, to make a living fence by their breasts, catching up the blasting wind of Russia, that it may not fall upon the poor, leaf-torn shrub of Hungary? No, I claim not this.

Or do I claim from you to beat back the bloody hand of the Austrian, that he may not waste the tempest-torn shrub, and not drain the life-sweat of its nursing soil? No, I do not claim that.

What is it, then, I claim from America? That same violence which shattered Hungary's bush has loosened, has bent, has nearly broken the pole called law of nations; without which no right is safe and no nation sure—none, were it even ten times so mighty as yours. I claim from America that it should fasten and make firm that pole called “law of nations,” that we may, with the nerve-strings of our own stout hearts, bind to it our nation's shattered shrub.

That is what I claim. And I ask you, in the name of the Almighty, is it too pretentious, is it too much arrogance to claim so much?

“In the law of nations every nation is just so much interested as every citizen in the laws of his country.” That is a wise word; it is the word of Mr. Webster, who, I am sure of it, in the high position he holds, intrusted with your country's foreign policy, would readily make good his own word if only his sovereign, the nation, be decided to back it, and says to him “Go on.”

Well, that maintenance of the law of nations would be, indeed, an immense benefit to my country—an immense benefit to all oppressed nations; because there is scarcely one among them all (Russia, perhaps, excepted) which very easily could not get rid of its own domestic oppressor, if only the infernal

bugbear "interference" stood not in the rear, ready to support every oppressor against the oppressed; but, I ask, is it an arrogance to claim an international duty, when that duty would be a benefit to our poor selves?

To whom shall the oppressed turn for the protection of law and of right, if not to those who have the power to protect that law and that right, upon which their own power, their own existence, rests?

Turn to God and trust to him, you say. Well, that we do. The Lord is our chief trust; but, precisely because we trust to God, we look around with confidence for the instrumentality of this protection.

And who shall be that instrumentality, if not you, people of America, for whom God has worked an evident wonder out, and upon this very place where I stand?

We may well praise the dignity of Carver and Bradford, the bravery of Standish, the devotion of Brewster, the enterprising spirit of Allerton, the unexampled fortitude and resignation of their women, the patience of their boys, the firmness, thoughtfulness, religious faith and confident boldness, of all the Pilgrims of the "Mayflower"; we may well praise that all; no praise is too high and none undeserved; but, after all, we must confess that the wonderful results of their pilgrimage—the nation which we see here—that is not their merit, as it could never have been the anticipation of their thoughts. No, that is no human merit; that is an evident miracle—the work of God.

What have they been, those Pilgrims of those days? What was their resolution, their aim, their design? Let me answer, in the eloquent words of Mr. Webster's last centennial address:

“They have been the personification of humble and peaceable religion flying from causeless oppression, conscience attempting to escape from arbitrary rule, braving a thousand dangers, to find here—what? A place of refuge and of rest.”

And what is it they have founded here? A mighty nation of twenty-four millions in the short period of two hundred and thirty-two years. Well, that has never entered the thoughts of the boldest of them.

The revolution of 1775 was no miracle; it was a necessity, an indication of your people's having come to the lawful age of a nation. Your assuming now the position of a power on earth, as I hope you will—that will again be no miracle. It would be wisdom, but the wisdom of doing what is good to humanity and necessary to yourselves. But, the United States of America—a result of the Pilgrim Fathers' landing on Plymouth Rock—that is no wisdom, no necessity; it is an evident miracle, a work of God.

And believe me, gentlemen, the Almighty God never deviates from the common laws of eternity for particular purposes; he never makes a miracle but for the benefit of all the world. By that truth the destiny of America is appointed out, and every destiny implies a duty to fulfil.

Happy the people which has the wisdom of its destiny and the resolution of its duties resulting therefrom. But woe to the people which takes not the place which Providence does appoint to it. With the intentions of Providence and with the decrees of the Almighty no man can dare to play. Self-reliance is a manly virtue, and no nation has a future which has not that virtue; but to believe that seventy-five years of prodigious growth dispense of every danger and of every care—that would be the surest way to provoke danger and to have much to care.

You will judge by this, gentlemen, if it was too much boldness on my part to believe that it is your country's destiny to regenerate the world by maintaining the laws of nations, or too much boldness to claim that which I believe is your destiny.

One humble prayer more I have; but that is addressed to your private generosity. When Weston's company of Weymouth was threatened by Indians, the Pilgrim colony of Plymouth supplied them with provisions, though they themselves could boast but of a very scanty store. Now the stores of your national prosperity are full of countless treasures and of boundless wealth. I ask out of your abundance a poor alms to my poor country; just so much as to buy with it a good rope, strong enough to fasten the shattered shrub of my country to the protecting pole of national law, and to buy a good battle-axe to beat off the hands of the tyrant from tearing to pieces the poor, shattered shrub.

And here let me end. I am out-worn; my mind has lost the freshness of ideas, only the old sorrows and old cares will neither be tired out nor go asleep. That is bad inspiration to oratory; but I will bear it, and go on in my duty, and hope good success; and will end with the words of that eloquent orator, who interpreted your people's wishes and sentiments at the second centennial anniversary of the day when the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, "May the Star-Span-gled Banner rise up as high as heaven, till it shall fan the air of both continents, and wave as a glorious ensign of peace and security to all nations."

FIRST SPEECH IN NEW YORK

I AM yet half sick, gentlemen; tossed and twisted about by a fortnight's gale on the Atlantic's restless waves; my giddy brains are still turning round as in a whirlpool, and this gigantic continent seems yet to tremble beneath my wavering steps. Let me, before I go to work, have some hours of rest upon this soil of freedom, your happy home. Freedom and home; what heavenly music in those two words! Alas! I have no home, and the freedom of my people is down-trodden. Young Giant of Free America, do not tell me that thy shores are an asylum to the oppressed and a home to the homeless exile. An asylum it is, but all the blessings of your glorious country, can they drown into oblivion the longing of the heart and the fond desires for our native land? My beloved native land! thy very sufferings make thee but dearer to my heart; thy bleeding image dwells with me when I wake, as it rests with me in the short moments of my restless sleep. It has accompanied me over the waves. It will accompany me when I go back to fight over again the battle of thy freedom once more. I have no idea but thee; I have no feeling but thee. Even here, with this prodigious view of greatness, freedom, and happiness which spreads before my astonished eyes, my thoughts are wandering toward home; and when I look over these thousands of thousands before me, the happy inheritance of yonder freedom for which your fathers fought and bled,—and when I turn to you, citizens, to bow before the majesty of the United States, and to thank the people of New York for their generous share in my liberation, and for the unpar-

alleled honor of this reception, I see, out of the very midst of this great assemblage, rise the bleeding image of Hungary, looking to you with anxiety, whether there be in the lustre of your eyes a ray of hope for her; whether there be in the thunder of your huzzas a trumpet call of resurrection. If there were no such ray of hope in your eyes, and no such trumpet call in your cheers, then woe to Europe's oppressed nations. They will stand alone in the hour of need. Less fortunate than you were, they will meet no brother's hand to help them in the approaching giant struggle against the leagued despots of the world; and woe, also, to me. I will feel no joy even here; and the days of my stay here will turn out to be lost to my fatherland; lost at the very time when every moment is teeming in the decision of Europe's destiny.

Citizens, much as I am wanting some hours of rest, much as I have need to become familiar with the ground I will have to stand upon before I enter upon business matters publicly, I took it for a duty of honor not to let escape even this first moment of your generous welcome without stating plainly and openly to you what sort of a man I am, and what are the expectations and the hopes, what are the motives which brought me now to your glorious shores.

Gentlemen, I have to thank the people, Congress, and government of the United States for my liberation from captivity. Human tongue has no words to express the bliss which I felt, when I—the down-trodden Hungary's wandering chief—saw the glorious flag of the Stripes and Stars fluttering over my head—when I first bowed before it with deep respect—when I saw around me the gallant officers and the crew of the "Mississippi" frigate—the most of them the worthiest representatives of true American principles, American greatness, American generosity—and to think that it was

not a mere chance which cast the Star-Spangled Banner around me, but that it was your protecting will—to know that the United States of America, conscious of their glorious calling, as well as of their power, declared, by this unparalleled act, to be resolved to become the protectors of human rights—to see a powerful vessel of America, coming to far Asia, to break the chains by which the mightiest despots of Europe fettered the activity of an exiled Magyar, whose very name disturbed the proud security of their sleep—to feel restored by such a protection, and, in such a way, to freedom, and by freedom to activity, you may be well aware of what I have felt, and still feel, at the remembrance of this proud moment of my life. Others spoke—you acted; and I was free! You acted; and at this act of yours, tyrants trembled; humanity shouted out with joy; the down-trodden people of Magyars—the down-trodden, but not broken—raised their heads with resolution and with hope, and the brilliancy of your stars was greeted by Europe's oppressed nations as the morning star of rising liberty. Now, gentlemen, you must be aware how boundless the gratitude must be which I feel for you. You have restored me to life—because, restored to activity; and should my life by the blessings of the Almighty, still prove useful to my fatherland and to humanity, it will be your merit—it will be your work. May you and your glorious country be blessed for it. Europe is on the very eve of such immense events that, however fervent my gratitude be to you, I would not have felt authorized to cross the Atlantic at this very time, only for the purpose to exhibit to you my warm thanks. I would have thanked you by facts, contributing to the freedom of the European continent, and would have postponed my visit to your glorious shores till the decisive battle for liberty was fought, if it

were my destiny to outlive that day. Then what is the motive of my being here at this very time?

The motive, citizens, is that your generous act of my liberation has raised the conviction throughout the world that this generous act of yours is but the manifestation of your resolution to throw your weight into the balance where the fate of the European continent is to be weighed. You have raised the conviction, throughout the world, that by my liberation you were willing to say, "Ye oppressed nations of old Europe's continent be of good cheer; the young giant of America stretches his powerful arm over the waves, ready to give a brother's hand to your future." So is your act interpreted throughout the world. You, in your proud security, can scarcely imagine how beneficial this conviction has already proved to the suffering nations of the European continent. You can scarcely imagine what self-confidence you have added to the resolution of the oppressed. You have knit the tie of solidarity in the destinies of nations. I cannot doubt that you know how I was received by the public opinion in every country which I touched since I am free, and what feelings my liberation has elicited in those countries which it was not my lot to touch. You know how I, a plain, poor, penniless exile, have almost become a centre of hope and confidence to the most different nations, not united but by the tie of common sufferings. What is the source of this apparition, unparalleled in mankind's history?

The source of it is, that your generous act of my liberation is taken by the world for the revelation of the fact that the United States are resolved not to allow the despots of the world to trample upon oppressed humanity. It is hence that my liberation was cheered, from Sweden down to Portugal, as a ray of hope. It is hence that even those nations which

most desire my presence in Europe now, have unanimously told me, "Hasten on, hasten on, to the great, free, rich and powerful people of the United States, and bring over its brotherly aid to the cause of your country, so intimately connected with European liberty;"—and here I stand to plead the cause of the solidarity of human rights before the great Republic of the United States.

Humble as I am, God, the Almighty, has selected me to represent the cause of humanity before you. My warrant to this capacity is written in the sympathy and confidence of all who are oppressed, and of all who, as your elder brother, the people of Britain, sympathize with the oppressed,—my warrant to this capacity is written in the hopes and expectations you have entitled the world to entertain, by liberating me out of my prison, and by restoring me to activity. But it has pleased the Almighty to make out of my humble self yet another opportunity for a thing which may prove a happy turning point in the destinies of the world. I bring you a brotherly greeting from the people of Great Britain. I speak not in an official character, imparted by diplomacy, whose secrecy is the curse of the world, but I am the harbinger of the public spirit of the people, which has the right to impart a direction to its government, and which I witnessed, pronouncing itself in the most decided manner, openly—that the people of England, united to you with enlightened brotherly love, as it is united in blood—conscious of your strength, as it is conscious of its own, has forever abandoned every sentiment of irritation and rivalry, and desires the brotherly alliance of the United States to secure to every nation the sovereign right to dispose of itself, and to protect the sovereign right of nations against the encroaching arrogance of despots; and leagued to you against the league

of despots, to stand together, with you, godfather to the approaching baptism of European liberty.

Now, gentlemen, I have stated my position. I am a straightforward man; I am a republican. I have avowed it openly in the monarchical but free England; and am happy to state that I have nothing lost by this avowal there. I hope I will not lose here, in republican America, by that frankness which must be one of the chief qualities of every republican. So I beg leave, frankly and openly, to state the following points:

First, that I take it to be the duty of honor and principle not to meddle with whatever party question of your own domestic affairs. I claim, for my country, the right to dispose of itself; so I am resolved, and must be resolved, to respect the same principle here and everywhere. May others delight in the part of knights-errant for theories. It is not my case. I am the man of the great principle of the sovereignty of every people to dispose of its own domestic concerns; and I most solemnly deny to every foreigner, and to every foreign power, the right to oppose the sovereign faculty.

Secondly, I profess, highly and openly, my admiration for the glorious principle of union on which stands the mighty pyramid of your greatness and upon the basis of which you have grown, in the short period of seventy-five years, to a prodigious giant, the living wonder of the world. I have the most warm wish that the Star-Spangled Banner of the United States may forever be floating, united and one, the proud ensign of mankind's divine origin; and taking my ground on this principle of union, which I find lawfully existing, an established constitutional fact, it is not to a party, but to the united people of the United States, that I confidently will address my humble requests for aid and protection to

oppressed humanity. I will conscientiously respect your laws, but within the limits of your laws I will use every honest exertion to gain your operative sympathy and your financial, material, and political aid for my country's freedom and independence, and entreat the realization of these hopes which your generosity has raised in me and my people's breasts, and also in the breasts of Europe's oppressed nations.

And therefore, thirdly, I beg leave frankly to state that my aim is to restore my fatherland to the full enjoyment of that act of declaration of independence which, being the only rightful existing public law of my nation, can nothing have been lost of its rightfulness by the violent invasion of foreign Russian arms, and which, therefore, is fully entitled to be recognized by the people of the United States, whose very resistance is founded upon a similar declaration of independence.

Thus, having expounded my aim, I beg leave to state that I came not to your glorious shores to enjoy a happy rest. I came not with the intention to gather triumphs of personal distinction, or to be the object of popular shows, but I came, a humble petitioner in my country's name, as its freely chosen constituted chief. What can be opposed to this recognition, which is a logical necessary consequence of the principle of your country's political existence. What can be opposed to it? The frown of Mr. Hulsemann; the anger of that satellite of the Czar, called Francis Joseph of Austria, and the immense danger with which some European and American papers threaten you—and by which, of course, you must feel extremely terrified—that your minister at Vienna will have offered his passports, and that Mr. Hulsemann leaves Washington, should I be received and treated in my official capacity? Now, as to your minister at Vienna, how you can com-

bine the letting him stay there with your opinion of the cause of Hungary, I really don't know; but so much I know, that the present absolutistical atmosphere of Europe is not very propitious to American principles. I know a man who could tell some curious facts about this matter. But as to Mr. Hulsemann, really I don't believe that he would be so ready to leave Washington. He has extremely well digested the caustic pills which Mr. Webster has administered to him so gloriously; but after all I know enough of the public spirit of the sovereign people of the United States, that it would never admit, to whatever responsible depository of the executive power should he even be willing to do so, which, to be sure, your high-minded government is not willing to do, to be regulated in its policy by all the Hulsemanns or all the Francis Josephs in the world. So I confidently hope that the sovereign of this country—the people—will make the declaration of independence of Hungary soon formally recognized, and that it will care not a bit for it if Mr. Hulsemann takes to-morrow his passports—*bon voyage* to him.

But it is also my agreeable duty to profess that I am entirely convinced that the government of the United States shares warmly the sentiments of the people in that respect. It has proved it by executing, in a ready and dignified manner, the resolution of Congress on behalf of my liberation. It has proved it by calling on the Congress to consider how I shall be treated and received, and even this morning I was honored, by the express order of the government, by an official salute from the batteries of the United States in such a manner in which, according to the military rules, only a public, high official capacity can be greeted.

Having thus expounded my aim, I beg leave to state that I came not to your glorious shores to enjoy a happy rest—I

came not with the intention to gather triumphs of personal distinction, but because a humble petitioner, in my country's name, as its freely chosen constitutional chief, humbly to entreat your generous aid; and then it is to this aim that I will devote every moment of my time, with the more assiduity, with the more restlessness, as every moment may bring a report of events which may call me to hasten to my place on the battlefield, where the great, and I hope, the last battle will be fought between Liberty and Despotism. A moment marked by the finger of God to be so near that every hour of delay of your generous aid may prove fatally disastrous to oppressed humanity; and, thus having stated my position to be that of a humble petitioner in the name of my oppressed country, let me respectfully ask, Do you not regret to have bestowed upon me the high honor of this glorious reception, unparalleled in history? I say unparalleled in history, though I know that your fathers have welcomed Lafayette in a similar way; but Lafayette had mighty claims to your country's gratitude; he had fought in your ranks for your freedom and independence; and, what still was more, in the hour of your need he was the link of your friendly connection with France, a connection the results of which were two French fleets of more than thirty-eight men-of-war and three thousand gallant men, who fought side by side with you against Cornwallis, before Yorktown; the precious gift of twenty-four thousand muskets, a loan of nineteen millions of dollars; and even the preliminary treaties of your glorious peace negotiated at Paris by your immortal Franklin. I hope the people of the United States, now itself in the happy condition to aid those who are in need of aid, as itself was once in need, will kindly remember these facts; and you, citizens of New York, and you will yourselves become the La-

fayettes of Hungary. Lafayette had great claims to your love and sympathy, but I have none. I came a humble petitioner, with no other claims than those which the oppressed have to the sympathy of freemen who have the power to help, with the claim which the unfortunate has to the happy, and the down-trodden has to the protection of eternal justice and of human rights. In a word, I have no other claims than those which the oppressed principle of freedom has to the aid of victorious liberty.

SIR ALEX. COCKBURN



SIR ALEXANDER JAMES EDMUND COCKBURN, English jurist and lord chief-justice, was born Dec. 24, 1802, and died at London, Nov. 20, 1880. He was educated at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, studied law at the Middle Temple, and was admitted to the Bar in 1829, up to this period being distinguished for cleverness rather than for industry. He soon, however, developed the latter quality and by 1841 had become Queen's Counsel, and in a few years acquired a considerable fortune in railway legislation. In 1847, he entered Parliament as Liberal member for Southampton, and for a time was solicitor-general. On June 28, 1850, he delivered a memorable speech before the Commons in defence of Palmerston's policy with reference to the claim of Don Pacifico and other British subjects upon the Greek government. A few hours later he denounced with great eloquence the cruelties which the government of Austria had inflicted upon the Magyar rebels. In 1851, Cockburn succeeded Sir John Romilly as attorney-general, and in 1856 became chief-justice of the court of common pleas, and in June, 1859, lord chief-justice of England. He was knighted in 1850. In 1873, he tried the famous Tichborne case, which lasted 188 days. His charge to the jury occupied twenty days in delivery and was a model of lucid statement of evidence. At the Geneva arbitration, in the famous "Alabama" case, he dissented from the award, believing that the responsibility of his government had not been proved. Cockburn was an able and eloquent lawyer, and uniformly courteous and generous to young counsel.

ON THE GREEK DIFFICULTY

[What was known about this time as the celebrated "Don Pacifico Case" originated as follows: Don Pacifico, a Jew of Portuguese extraction, was a native of Gibraltar, and therefore a British subject. He resided at Athens, where it was a time-honored custom to burn an effigy of Judas Iscariot at Easter. The police prevented this celebration in 1847, whereupon the mob, attributing the action to the influence of the Jews, wreaked their resentment upon Don Pacifico, whose house stood close to the spot annually chosen for the burning of Judas. His claim against the Greek government, side by side with that of Mr. Finlay, being ignored, the British government took upon itself to redress the wrongs of its subjects. The following speech was delivered in the House of Commons, June 28, 1850.]

I THINK, sir, as I was personally and pointedly alluded to in the course of the debate last night by the right honorable the member for the University of Oxford [Mr. Gladstone], that the House will not consider me presumptu-

ous if I trespass for a short time upon its patience. I am anxious, sir, in the first place, if the House will indulge me for a moment, to set myself right with the right honorable gentleman. He was pleased in the course of his observations in the House last night to say that I had "sneered" at him. Now, I beg to assure the right honorable gentleman and the House that nothing on earth was further from my wishes or intentions than to show him the slightest disrespect or discourtesy. The right honorable gentleman, with his accustomed talent, threw down the gauntlet on the floor of this House and challenged a reply from any honorable member to the facts which he stated or to the principles of law which he then enunciated. I felt, sir, at the time, as truly and as fully convinced as I ever was of anything in my life, that the right honorable gentleman's facts were totally inaccurate, and that his law was utterly intolerable. I ventured, therefore, to accept the challenge which he so threw out, and I meant by my cheer on that occasion—a mode which I believe to be a perfectly parliamentary one of expressing that sentiment—to say that I was ready and anxious to accept the challenge of the right honorable gentleman, and I am now prepared to answer him, although I am fully conscious of the vast difference of ability and disparity of power which exists between us; for the right honorable gentleman, from his position, his high character, and, above all, his great abilities, is entitled to be treated with the utmost respect by every member of this House.

Having thus put myself right with the right honorable gentleman, I must take the liberty of saying this, that in all my experience I never heard such a series of misrepresentations and misstatements as those which were made by the right honorable gentleman; and I will undertake to prove this assertion, step by step, and position by position, if the House

will grant me its indulgence and forbearance. I feel, however, the great difficulty in which I am placed in entering upon this debate. If I go into the details of the case for the purpose of showing the fallacies, both in the statements and arguments of the right honorable gentleman, I shall be told, by and by, because I have the misfortune of belonging to a legal profession, that it was a *nisi prius* mode of conducting my argument. I think, however, that the manner in which the discussion of this subject has been conducted, both in this House and in another place, has given us abundant evidence that it is not those only who practise in Westminster Hall who are possessed of the power of arguing in *nisi prius* fashion. For of all the pettifogging proceedings which I have ever known during my experience, this is the worst. It was so commenced elsewhere, and in the same spirit it has been conducted here. If honorable gentlemen choose to introduce this subject to Parliament, and make a grave accusation against her Majesty's government, and then conduct it, not upon the great principles of natural honor, but by raising questions of minute details and technicalities, by grossly perverting facts and distorting evidence, and by an utter misrepresentation of what were the true principles that ought to govern this case, let them not be astonished if those who belong to the legal profession, whose habits are to criticise and investigate with logical strictness every species of evidence, to minutely analyze facts as well as study the broad principles of municipal and national law, stung to the quick by the manifest injustice of this proceeding, should rush into the discussion; and above all, let not the charge come from them that the men having these acquirements are treating the subject in a *nisi prius* spirit.

I am now speaking for the interest of my profession; and I

must say that I never heard an observation more ungracious, or made in worse taste, than that which fell from the right honorable baronet the member for Ripon [Sir F. Graham], following, as it did, on the admirable speech of my honorable and learned friend, the member for Oxford [Mr. William Page Wood], than which a more masterly analysis of facts and a more convincing speech in point of argument and of law I never heard. It certainly never was surpassed in this House or in any other place. It altogether demolished the whole case against the government in all that respected Greece. And yet the right honorable baronet, because he found he was unable to grapple with the arguments of my honorable and learned friend, nor even tried to do so, said: "Oh, it is not fair to deal with this great question upon such narrow ground, or with reference to the case of Greece alone—it is all founded upon blue-books, a pack of rubbish; mere *nisi prius*. Let us come to that which is the great issue to be decided by the House, the foreign policy of the government." Now, that certainly strikes me as being a very odd position for the right honorable baronet to take, when it is considered that the verdict which has been passed by the other House of Parliament against her Majesty's government, and in consequence of which verdict they are requested to resign, proceeded entirely, not upon the question of the general policy of the government, but exclusively and distinctly upon the line pursued by them in respect of Greece. The right honorable baronet then went into the whole of the foreign policy of the country, leaving out of view the whole of the Greek case. The right honorable baronet was followed by the right honorable gentleman for South Wiltshire [Mr. Sidney Herbert], and he followed exactly in the same track, threw the Greek question overboard, and took his stand upon

the foreign policy of the government. Then came the right honorable gentleman the member for the University of Oxford, whom I suppose we are now to consider as the representative of Lord Stanley in this House: "Gladstone *vice* Disraeli,"—am I to say, "resigned" or "superseded"?

There are therefore two questions before the House. The right honorable baronet the member for Ripon, and the right honorable member for South Wiltshire, boldly come forward and take up the question of the whole foreign policy of the government; while the right honorable gentleman the member for the University of Oxford, arguing his case upon the *nisi prius* style, takes his stand upon the Greek question only. Which of these two different positions is the House to consider? Is it the right honorable baronet the member for Ripon, or that of the right honorable gentleman the member for the University of Oxford? It is a matter of perfect indifference to me. I am prepared to go into both. But I must say this, that I do not think, if you sever your cases for the prosecution, if the honorable gentlemen will allow me to use so technical a phrase, and shift the ground of your accusation from one point to the other, I claim as a right that we may be fairly heard upon both. And do not tell us when we meet you on the Greek case that it is all mere *nisi prius*, but allow us to show you what the facts are, and what the nature of your arguments, and I will undertake to say that we will demolish your whole case, nor leave you a leg to stand upon.

Her Majesty's government have, it appears, interfered in the affairs of Greece for the purpose of redressing certain wrongs sustained by the subjects of this empire; and the point in dispute is whether they were justified in the course which they took upon that occasion. Now, as it is impossible to dis-

pute that in this instance the subjects of her Majesty have sustained wrong—a fact which no one has attempted to deny—they were most unquestionably entitled to redress from the government of the country in which they happened to be at the time they sustained such wrong; but if the laws of that country where the wrongs were perpetrated afforded no means of redress, they became unquestionably entitled to redress from the government of that country; and if the government would not redress those wrongs, it was not only the right, but the bounden duty of the government of this country to interfere on behalf of its subjects, and to obtain redress for the wrongs which they had suffered. I take it to be a fundamental principle in the policy of nations that it is the right and duty of a State to protect its subjects against injuries sustained at the hands of other States, or subjects of such States. This has been the principle upon which nations have acted in all ages. The noble lord who addressed the House the other night [Lord Palmerston] referred to the great principle that the Roman State never allowed a Roman citizen to be injured. But what said the right honorable member for the University of Oxford to that? He said that it was because Rome exercised a universal dominion over the world; because it considered a Roman citizen as superior to the subjects of all other States, and by its universal supremacy and power was enabled to tyrannize over other countries, and obtain redress for the wrongs sustained by its citizens even in cases where they were not entitled to such redress. I dissent from that position altogether. I say that it was not after the Roman empire had become established, and had obtained its supremacy over the whole world, that that position was first taken up by the Roman State. It was a principle upon which it acted from the very earliest ages of the empire, and there-

fore it was that the great orator was entitled triumphantly to exclaim, with all the noble pride and triumph of a Roman, "*Quot bella majores nostri suscepti erint, quot cives Romani injuria affecti sunt, navicularii retenti, mercatores spoliati, esse dicerentur.*" It was not only before they had established universal dominion over the world that they adopted this principle, but it was at a period of their history when they had to fight their battles for empire with other States upon almost equal terms, that they invariably asserted that first right and duty of a State to protect its citizens, and to obtain redress for their wrongs when they sustained any at the hands of other States. That course, I take it, was not unknown to this country either in one of the most glorious periods of its history. What is it that, in spite of all the dark shades that rest upon his character, has made the memory of Cromwell illustrious? What but that he would suffer no Englishman to be injured by any State or potentate, no matter how great? But, after all, can the proposition be denied that the government of a country is bound to obtain redress for and to afford protection to its citizens when injured? The right honorable gentleman the member for the University of Oxford did not dispute that position; but he qualified it by saying that British subjects living in foreign states, and sustaining any wrong there, either from the government of the country or any of the subjects of that State, are bound to have recourse to the tribunals of the country for redress, and if redress can be obtained from such tribunals they are not to call upon the country of which they are the subjects to interfere. I cheerfully assent to that proposition, and I will undertake to make it perfectly manifest that in neither of the cases which have led to the interference of this country was there the slightest or most remote probability—

looking to the law of Greece, and the condition of its tribunals—that any English subject, however injured, could succeed in obtaining redress from the tribunals of that country.

Now I will take in the first place the case of Mr. Finlay. I do not intend to cite blue-books upon this subject—the whole matter is capable of being placed before the House in a very short and succinct form. Mr. Finlay, it appears, was the proprietor of some land in Athens. That gentleman, with some other inhabitants at Athens, was anxious, when King Otho was in possession of the actual sovereignty of Greece, to induce the king to fix the seat of government at Athens; and accordingly Mr. Finlay, with those other inhabitants, presented a memorial to the government of Greece proposing to give or sell the land which belonged to them to the government upon certain terms, in order that it might be made applicable for the establishment of the necessary public buildings in Athens, with the view of inducing the government to fix it there. But they coupled their offer of the land with these conditions, that the land to be taken should be scheduled and set out within six months from the time of taking possession of it. When the government came to Athens, the land of many of the individuals which had been thus offered to the government was taken. Mr. Finlay's land, however, was not so taken. The land taken by the Greek government of the other individuals was paid for according to a price which the parties had agreed upon; and it is easy to understand that the inhabitants of a city like Athens, possessing property, and being desirous of bringing the government to Athens, should be perfectly willing to dispose of a portion of their land at a lower rate, if by so doing they could attain their object, as the existence of the government at Athens would

have the effect of enhancing the value of the remainder of their property. Mr. Finlay's land was not, however, taken upon this ground; it was taken some time after by the arbitrary command of the king, without law or ordinance, or without anything whatever which could give a sanction to such a proceeding—nothing except the arbitrary and absolute will of the sovereign.

That is a matter of fact upon which I defy any man to dispute. That being done, what was the consequence? Mr. Finlay's land was taken and converted into the palace garden of the king. Mr. Finlay applied for compensation in 1836; and according to the statement of Sir Edmund Lyons—who, I apprehend, notwithstanding the insinuations of the right honorable gentleman the member for the University of Oxford, is in every way worthy of credit—the proceedings of Mr. Finlay toward the Greek government were characterized by the most gentlemanly moderation and forbearance; yet for six long years (until 1842) Mr. Finlay continued, from time to time, to put forward, kindly and temperately, his demand for compensation. Do you tell me that the delay arose from any dispute as to the amount of compensation which should be given to that gentleman? He could not obtain even the slightest answer to his communications. But in 1842, when this injustice became too grievous to be patiently borne any longer, Mr. Finlay addressed the noble lord who was at the head of foreign affairs of this country—not the present lord, but the Earl of Aberdeen—who instructed Sir Edmund Lyons to apply to the Greek government, and to enforce by all means in his power the legitimate demands of Mr. Finlay. What was the result? After a great deal of difficulty and delay the king of Greece proposed to issue a commission to inquire into the claims of Mr. Finlay. But of whom was it proposed that

the commission should consist? Of M. Glarakis and M. Manitaki, the Minister of the Interior. One of these persons was a most remarkable character; and Sir Edward Codrington, speaking of him in a public despatch, said that he was a man who had made himself notorious by fostering and encouraging pirates. The other was a mere creature of the king, and would have acted, if appointed, on the part of the king.

Mr. Finlay therefore objected to this commission. Further communications took place, and no redress could be obtained. This was in 1845. Now a commission thus constituted Mr. Finlay was justified in repudiating. He said very truly, "It is not an inspired tribunal; I can place no confidence in it; I will have nothing to do with it, but will appeal to the government at home." He did so, and the present noble lord, then at the head of foreign affairs, having inquired into the matter, a despatch was sent to Sir Edmund Lyons, instructing him to enforce the claims of Mr. Finlay. The king proposed another commission, which was appointed, and in the end, after all these years of evasion, shuffling, quirks, and chicanery of every description, it was agreed to refer the matter to arbitration. At first the Greek government had the assurance to propose that it should have the nomination of the umpire; but being shamed out of this extravagant proposal, a proper umpire was appointed. What was the next trick they resorted to? Why, they delayed the production of the necessary documents beyond the period of three months within which, by the law of Greece, an arbitration must be concluded or it falls to the ground. The right honorable gentleman [Mr. Gladstone] has stated that the delay had originated with Mr. Finlay; but this is not so; the blue-book proves directly the contrary. It was the government who asked for the delay.

Now, was this fair of the right honorable gentleman? Talk of *nisi prius*, indeed! At least lawyers hold this at *nisi prius*—that though they may use sophistry to induce a jury or a court to adopt their conclusions, it is a sacred duty not to misstate facts.

Well, then, Mr. Finlay could get no redress; but the right honorable gentleman the member for the University of Oxford says he might have gone to the tribunals of the country. The tribunals of the country, indeed! They say, “a little learning is a dangerous thing”; but this is equally the case when applied to law. The right honorable gentleman possesses every quality which would have made a most brilliant advocate. He has eloquence unlimited, subtlety unrivalled, casuistry unexampled; all he wants is a little knowledge of law. If he had not been a great statesman he would have been a great lawyer if he only would have condescended to put on the wig and gown, and acquired a little knowledge of the very first principles of law. I would advise him, if he would accept of my humble advice, to confine himself to that science of which he is so great a master—politics—and not to meddle with law. The right honorable gentleman is ignorant of the fundamental principle of law—that a subject cannot sue a sovereign. That is the rule in every country, with the exception of this. And why is it not the law in England? Simply because, by the established usage and magnanimous practice of this country, the sovereign, upon the petition of a subject complaining of a wrong sustained from the Crown, refers it to the first law officer of the Crown and indorses upon the petition the important and solemn words, “Let right be done.” And upon that the sovereign condescends to submit herself to an equality with her subjects before the throne of law, and allow justice to be administered between

her and the meanest of her subjects by the ordinary tribunals of the land. And thank God that we have tribunals and that we have judges who would administer the law between the sovereign and her subjects with so much impartiality, with as even a hand and with as unbiassed a mind as between any two ordinary persons. But is that the case in Greece? No! I ask, then, what becomes of the position that Mr. Finlay could have appealed to the tribunals of the country against the king of Greece? The king of Greece is utterly irresponsible, not only politically, but civilly, to any of his subjects, and you can only seek redress, if you have sustained any injury, against the officers of state. In this case, however, the officers of state were not responsible, because this matter had occurred before the constitution by which alone even they became responsible and were called into power. With respect, therefore, to the claim of Mr. Finlay, I think that case is pretty well disposed of.

I now come to M. Pacifico, and I rejoice that we shall be able to discuss that case on its merits, and not on the ground of M. Pacifico being a Jew or a usurer, or, as it was ungenerously suggested, and when he could not defend himself, a delinquent who had committed an act of forgery. All these questions are utterly beside the one at issue. And here, sir, let me say that I never felt stronger indignation than when I read the observations, as to who and what M. Pacifico was and is, which have been repeated over and over again in that portion of the press devoted to the interests of Russian despotism, and which have been spoken over and over again by certain lords who come forward either for their own behoof or that of Continental tyrants. According to these authorities M. Pacifico is a species of Jew broker, a Jew usurer, a Jew trafficker, a hybrid Jew. And then, sir, forsooth, we

are told in the same breath as that in which such phrases are employed, that they are not used to prejudice the individual to whom they are applied! For what purpose then, I ask, are they used? Why, sir, even at *nisi prius* we should not stoop to such shabby artifices as these. Even lawyers would not resort to such mean and dirty acts as these; they would not think themselves justified in saying that, on a man sustaining a civil wrong and demanding justice, the question was to be tried by his character; yet that has been done again and again to prejudice this case. However, the right honorable gentleman, in taking the place of those who had carried on this accusation against the government elsewhere, thought it necessary to protect himself from being supposed to take any part in such acts as these. But the right honorable gentleman has pursued the course followed elsewhere of making the most of the abused extravagance of M. Pacifico's demand. But I will show the House that the amount of compensation claimed has nothing to do with the question; and for this simple reason, it never was a matter of dispute with the Greek government. The objection which the Greek government took was to the principle of the demand, not to its amount. The dispute never advanced as far as to have anything to do with the amount.

As for the wrongs inflicted on M. Pacifico, I need not dwell upon them. They are known to all the world. The man was outraged in his person, in his family, and in his property. The question then is, Was he entitled to redress? He may be a Jew, a broker, a usurer, a hybrid Jew—he may have committed an act of forgery. It is possible—although God forbid that I should believe such a charge against any man without the opportunity of answering it!—he may have been a forger; it did not lie in the mouth of the Portuguese govern-

ment to say so, after having appointed him consul—first at Morocco, and then at Athens; but for all that he was injured, and therefore entitled to redress. Now, what are the known facts as to his position? He had been living at Athens for many years in comfort and respectability—a substantial citizen, carrying on his business with the Greek people. Well, he was grievously injured. The right honorable gentleman said he ought to have gone before the Greek tribunals. What tribunals? He did go before one. He tried to proceed in a criminal court—with what success we know. A crime had been committed in the broad daylight, at noon, in the midst of Athens. The perpetrators were seen and well known. They were denounced to the police; and the police, in reply, contended that there was no evidence to fix their identity, and so let them loose again. So much for the honor and honesty of Greek tribunals. But the right honorable gentleman says, Why did he not go before a civil tribunal? Why did he not sue the rioters for damages? Good God! Is it possible that the right honorable gentleman can be in earnest? Does he really consider us so weak, so fallible, as to be likely to swallow an obvious, a palable, or gross absurdity such as that? What! seek for compensation from a mob—from a rabble of brigands, vagabonds, and ruffians, in rags and tatters, who wrecked his house and stole his furniture? Is he to proceed for damages against such a horde as this? Let me ask the House—let me ask the right honorable gentleman this question: Suppose that, in some time of trouble and popular excitement, a mob were to sack his house, as the mob sacked M. Pacifico's, would he bring an action against each and every member of that mob? We have had instances of such riots taking place, I think, Nottingham Castle was destroyed. It belonged to the Duke of Newcastle. Did he

prosecute the mob for damages? The Marquis of Londonderry's house in St. James's Square was attacked and damaged. Did he prosecute the mob for damages? The palace of the bishop at Bristol was burnt down, and property to a great extent destroyed. Did he prosecute the mob for damages? No; you don't proceed against paupers. There is nothing to be got out of them.

Observe the difference between Greece and this country. England, with wiser legislation, proceeding on the principle that for injuries done in times of tumult it is idle to leave the people to a remedy by civil action against the parties committing them, provides this wise regulation: that in the case of such injuries the local community, the hundred, should be responsible for the property which has been demolished. If, however, the property fall under a certain category for which the hundred is not liable, the government is nevertheless bound to make the loss good, so that no owner of property need suffer from the lawless violence of mobs, which it is the business of the executive to keep in order.¹ If, then, this state of things had existed in Athens—if M. Pacifico could have claimed redress from the Greek tribunals, he was no doubt bound to go there. But I say he could not. It is idle to assert that he could. The right honorable gentleman tells us that there are courts of law in Greece, that there is a regular bar there, always ready to undertake the case of anybody applying to them. Is there? Stop a minute. M. Pacifico having been attacked a second time, and having made his complaint, the noble lord at the head of the foreign office instructed Sir Edmund Lyons to institute a prosecution against the parties who had committed the outrage. What

¹ A modern instance of the working of this principle was the compensation granted by the government to the sufferers by the Socialist riots in the West End of London in February, 1886.

was the result? The offending parties had actually been apprehended, when M. Pacifico was told that he could not get a lawyer to bring his case on, and that such was the strict compulsion under which the courts were kept that they did not dare to place themselves in opposition to the prime minister of the country.

But, says the right honorable gentleman, the judges at Athens administer justice impartially and fairly; there is a court called the Areopagus, and its judges are perfectly free to act according to the dictates of their conscience. Let me tell the right honorable gentleman that he never labored under a more complete mistake. The constitution undoubtedly provides that the judges shall not be dismissed at the king's pleasure; but they are so dismissed every day. And not only that, but the Greek government have established this system—and it shows their Greek subtlety, as they have a number of courts of equal jurisdiction and authority—they transplant the judges from one to the other, as the purpose of each case may seem to require. When a particular case which the government is interested in bringing to a particular decision occurs in a court, why then they transplant the judge on whom they can depend into that court. Let me cite an instance. An action was brought by M. Piscatori, the French ambassador at Athens, against the editor of a newspaper published there—the “Athena.” This was in 1846. M. Piscatori was, of course, all-powerful with the government. Well, the sentence was against the editor. Two of the judges pronounced for his acquittal; three for his condemnation. One of the former, called, I believe, Disachi, was summarily dismissed in the following curt terms: “The king has been pleased to remove you from the bench.” Well, the editor appealed to the court of the Are-

opagus, and on the eve of his case coming on, two of his judges who were to be were suddenly dismissed, without any reason whatever being assigned. I have these facts from authority upon which I can implicitly rely, and for their exact truth I pledge myself to the House. Again, there was a president of the court of the Areopagus called Cleonares. He was dismissed upon the instant, without any reason assigned, but for causes of which no one who has listened to what I have stated can for a moment doubt.

And after this you tell me that the Greek tribunals are pure. "Oh, but," says the right honorable gentleman, "I produce Sir Edmund Lyons to prove my case. He says that the press is free, and the tribunals are fair and independent." True; Sir Edmund Lyons says so; but when? Sir, the reference to Sir Edmund Lyons shows that there are other texts besides those of Scripture which the —— which certain persons can quote for their own purposes. The despatch in question was written in 1836, and under what circumstances? King Otho having been advised by his father, as young gentlemen who have lived too fast and extravagantly sometimes are, to go and travel and look out for a wife,—of course, a rich one,—obeyed the paternal injunction, and left his kingdom under the charge of Count Armansperg, who took advantage of the absence of his royal master to set matters a little to rights. Well, he began by reforming the tribunals, by making them independent. He set the press free—he established provincial councils, so as to give the people some sort of means of expressing their opinions on public matters—in short, he set the kingdom so far to rights, hoping, of course, that upon the return of his royal master he would reap the reward of his merits in a rich overflow of royal favors. Notice, however, of what Count Armansperg had

been doing had, it seems, been conveyed to King Otho, who straightway returned in alarm, and before the boat which conveyed him from the ship touched the soil of Greece, Count Armansperg was ignominiously dismissed. Arbitrary dominion resumed its tyrannical rule—injustice, oppression, and wrong were re-established in their old supremacy; and such is the system which has ruled supreme in Greece ever since.

Well, to proceed. The right honorable gentleman dwelt last night on the case of the man Sumachi, who was tortured; and he set out by saying that he did not believe Sumachi's statement, and that Sir Edmund Lyons was just the man ready to receive and record any unauthenticated case bearing against the Greek government. Sir, I say that Sir Edmund Lyons is a man who, after eight or nine years' service as minister of Athens, received, as a token of his sovereign's approbation, the Grand Cross of the Bath; and I hope that a gentleman who has been thus specially and highly honored is at least entitled to have his official assertions believed—at all events until the contrary shall have been shown. But is this case of Sumachi a single instance? No. Torture has over and over again been applied in Greece. Torture, I repeat, is commonly applied in Greece. I can prove innumerable instances of it. One is so disgusting that I cannot mention it; yet I ought to mention it—I will mention it. I feel that it ought to be told, that we may at least know what these people, of whom so much has been said, really are. How do they torture women? They attach cats to their naked persons, and then flog the animals, that in their furious struggles they may lacerate the flesh to which they are tied. Another species of torture is this: a man is tied, hands, feet, and head together, and in this position flung upon the

ground and bastinadoed. And still, sir, the right honorable gentleman is right—perfectly right—in saying that all such atrocities are forbidden by the constitution of Greece. But what is the value of that constitution? I say, sir, not so much as that of the paper on which it is written. It has been set aside, violated, outraged in every respect and in every way. It exists but in name; while oppression and corruption reign in unmitigated horror in its room.

And now, sir, I dismiss the right honorable gentleman and his Greek arguments. I trust I have given him and them satisfactory answers. Transcendent as are the abilities of the right honorable gentleman, I believe that even his talents will not support a case when truth is in the other scale. But truth, if it does not prevail here, will prevail elsewhere. The country is beginning to appreciate what is the truth in this question. The country will fully appreciate, too, the motives which induce you, after four years of silence, now at length to come forward and attack the noble lord at the head of the foreign affairs of this country. But whatever may be the result here, I tell you that the people of England will only rally the more heartily around that government which stands pledged to extend the safeguard of its power to all its subjects, in whatever land their business may have led them; and which is also able and willing, if on any occasion it may be too late to interfere for the purposes of protection, at all events to stand forward and to demand from them reparation and redress.

BULWER-LYTTON



EDWARD GEORGE EARLE LYTTON-BULWER, LORD LYTTON, British novelist, poet, playwright, and politician, was born at London, May 25, 1803, and died at Torquay, Devonshire, Jan. 18, 1873. Educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, he entered Parliament in 1831, having married meanwhile an Irish beauty (Rosina Wheeler), against his mother's wishes, and from whom he separated in 1836, after bearing him a daughter and a son, the latter the politician, poet, and diplomatist, Earl Lytton. In 1838, Bulwer-Lytton was created a baronet and assumed, in accordance with his mother's will, the name of Lytton, and in 1866 rose to the peerage. While a Commoner, his versatile gifts manifested themselves as a speaker and statesman, for he had become, in 1858, Secretary of State for the Colonies, and had made at least two notable speeches, one, in 1855, on the Crimean War (here appended), and one, in 1859, on Lord Derby's Reform Bill of that year. His reputation had meanwhile been made in literary fields, in the production of plays such as "Money," "Richelieu," and "The Lady of Lyons," and in fiction in such popular novels as "Pelham," "Devereux," "Paul Clifford," "Eugene Aram," "Godolphin," "The Last Days of Pompeii," "Harold," "Night and Morning," "The Last of the Barons," "The Caxtons," "My Novel,"—to name but a few of his earlier and brilliant successes as a novelist and writer of plays. Prolific as he was, and writing with great rapidity, it is surprising how much of his work endures, and how widely varied were his themes in so many different departments of literary, social, and political activity. His later stories of note are: "What will He do with It?" "Kenelm Chillingly," "The Parisians," "The Coming Race," and "Pausanias." Among his miscellaneous works are his translation of Schiller's poems, the odes of Horace, "King Arthur," "The New Timon," and "The Last Tales of Miletus."

ON THE CRIMEAN WAR

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, JUNE 4, 1855

SIR,—The right honorable gentleman the member for Manchester [Mr. Milner Gibson], toward the close of his able speech, summed up his strongest objections to the continuance of the war by asking how it would profit the country. In answer to that question let me remind the right honorable gentleman of the laudable earnestness with which, in a recent debate, he assured the House that he, and those with whom he concurred in the policy to be adopted for the restoration of peace, were no less anxious than we are for the due maintenance of the national honor.

I cordially believe him; and when he asks how the continuance of the war can profit the country, I answer, because the continuance of the war is as yet essential to the vindication of the national honor, and because the national honor is the bulwark of the national interests. For there is this distinction between individuals and nations: with the first a jealous tenacity of honor may be a mere sentiment, with the last it is a condition of power.

If you lower the honor of a man in the eyes of his equals, he may still say, "My fortune is not attacked, my estate is unimpaired, the laws still protect my rights and my person, I can still command my independence and bestow my beneficence upon those who require my aid;" but if you lower the honor of a nation in the eyes of other states, and especially a nation like England, which owes her position, not to her territories, but to her character; not to the amount of her armies, nor even to the pomp of her fleets, but to a general belief in her high spirit and indomitable will—her interests will be damaged in proportion to the disparagement of her name. You do not only deface her scutcheons, you strike down her shield. Her credit will be affected, her commerce will suffer at its source.

Take the awe from her flag, and you take the wealth from her merchants; in future negotiations her claims will be disputed, and she can never again interfere with effect against violence and wrong in behalf of liberty and right.

These are some of the consequences which might affect the interests of this country if other nations could say, even unjustly, that England had grown unmindful of her honor. But would they not say it with indisputable justice if, after encouraging Turkey to a war with her most powerful enemy, we could accept any terms of peace which Turkey herself

indignantly refuses to indorse? Honor, indeed, is a word on which many interpreters may differ, but at least all interpreters must agree upon this, that the essential of honor is fidelity to engagements. What are the engagements by which we have pledged ourselves to Turkey? Freedom from the aggressions of Russia. Is that all? No; reasonable guaranties that the aggression shall not be renewed. But would any subject of the Ottoman Empire think such engagements fulfilled by a peace that would not take from Russia a single one of her fortresses, a single one of her ships, by which she now holds Constantinople itself under the very mouth of her cannon?

Sir, both the members for Manchester have the merit of consistency in the cause they espouse. They were against this war from the first. But I cannot conceive how any government which led us into this war and is responsible for all it has cost us should now suddenly adopt the language of peace societies, and hold it as a crime if we push to success the enterprise which they commenced by a failure.

I approach the arguments of the right honorable member for the University of Oxford [Mr. Gladstone] with a profound respect for his rare intellect and eloquence, and still more for that genuine earnestness which assures us that if he ever does diverge into sophistry and paradox it is not till he has religiously puzzled his conscience into a belief of their simplicity and truth.

The main argument on which the right honorable gentleman rests the vindication of the views he entertains is this: He says, "I supported the war at the commencement because then it was just; I would now close the war because its object may be attained by negotiation."

That is his proposition; I would state it fairly. But what

at the commencement was the object of the war, stripped of all diplomatic technicalities? The right honorable gentleman would not, I am sure, accept the definition of his ex-colleague, the right honorable member for Southwark [Sir William Molesworth], that one object of the war was to punish Russia for her insolence—a doctrine I would never have expected in so accomplished a philosopher as my right honorable friend, the pupil of Bentham and the editor of “Hobbes.” Either in war or legislation, punishment is only a means which has for its object the prevention of further crime.

The right honorable gentleman the member for the University of Oxford will no doubt say to me, The object was the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire. But how did he describe that object in his speech at Manchester in September, 1853? He said then to that important audience (I quote his very words):

“Remember the independence and integrity of Turkey are not like the independence of England and France. It is a government full of anomaly, of difficulty, and distress.”

This is the mode in which, simultaneously with those articles in the “Times” quoted by the right honorable member for Manchester [Mr. Gibson], on the very eve of a war that the right honorable member for the University of Oxford then believed to be just, and when he would naturally place the object in the most favorable light his convictions would permit before the people whose ardor it became his duty to rouse, whose pockets it was his office to tax—this is the laudatory mode in which the right honorable gentleman warmed the enthusiasm of his listeners to acknowledge the justice of his object; and is the statesman who at the onset could take so chilling a view of all the great human interests involved in

this struggle likely to offer us unprejudiced and effective counsels for securing to Turkey that independence and integrity in which he sees anomaly and distress and in which we see the safeguard to Europe?

The right honorable gentleman complains that the terms in which our object is to be sought are now unwisely extended. Who taught us to extend them? Who made not only the terms but the object itself indefinite? Was it not the head of the government of which the right honorable gentleman was so illustrious a member? Did not Lord Aberdeen, when repeatedly urged to state to what terms of peace he would apply the epithets "safe" and "honorable," as repeatedly answer, "That must depend on the fortune of war; and the terms will be very different if we receive them at Constantinople or impose them at St. Petersburg"?

Sir, if I may say so without presumption, I always discourage that language. I always held the doctrine that if we once went to war it should be for nothing more and nothing less than justice. [Mr. M. Gibson: "Hear, hear!"]

Ay, but do not let me dishonestly catch that cheer, for I must add, "and also for adequate securities that justice will be maintained." No redresses should induce us to ask for less—no conquests justify us in demanding more. But when the right honorable gentleman, being out of office, now also asserts that doctrine, why did he not refuse his sanction to the noble earl, who took the whole question out of the strict limits of abstract justice the moment he made the indefinite arbitration of military success the only principle to guide us in the objects and terms of peace?

And if the right honorable gentleman rigidly desired to limit our war to one of protection, how could he have consented to sit in a cabinet which at once changed its whole

character into a war of invasion? All the complications which now surround us—all the difficulties in the way of negotiation which now perplex even the right honorable gentleman's piercing intellect—date from the day you landed in the Crimea and laid siege to Sebastopol. I do not say your strategy was wrong; but, wrong or right, when you invaded the Crimea you inevitably altered the conditions on which to establish peace.

The right honorable gentleman was a party to that campaign, and he cannot now shrink from its logical consequences. Those consequences are the difficulties comprehended in the third article—the lie that your policy would give to your actions if you accepted the conditions proposed by Russia; for why did you besiege Sebastopol but because it was that fortress which secured to Russia her preponderance in the Black Sea, and its capture or dismantlement was the material guarantee you then and there pledged yourselves to obtain for the independence of Turkey and the security of Europe? And if the fortunes of war do not allow you yet to demand that Sebastopol be disfortified, they do authorize you to demand an equivalent in Russia's complete resignation of a fleet in the Black Sea; for at this moment not one Russian ship can venture to show itself in those waters.

If the right honorable gentleman is perplexed to determine what mode of limiting the Russian preponderance can be invented, one rule for his guidance at least he is bound to consider imperative—namely, that the mode of limitation must be one which shall not content England alone, but the ally to whom the faith of England was pledged by the cabinet which the right honorable gentleman adorned. It is strange to what double uses the right honorable gentleman can put an ally. When we wished to inquire into the causes of calam-

ities purely our own—calamities which the right honorable gentleman thinks were so exaggerated—an exaggeration that inquiry has not served to dispel—then we are told, “What are you doing? Take care! To inquire into the fate of an English army may offend and alienate our ally, France.”

But now, when the right honorable gentleman would have desired us to patch up a peace, he forgets altogether that we have an ally upon the face of the globe. He recommends us singly to creep out of the quarrel with Russia, and would leave us equally exposed to the charge of desertion by Turkey and of perfidy by France. But it has been insinuated, I know not on what authority, that France would have listened to these terms if we had advised it. If this be true, I thank our government for declining such a responsibility. For if, in that noble courtesy which has characterized the Emperor of the French in his intercourse with us, he had yielded to your insistence and consented to resume and complete negotiations based upon terms he had before refused, who amongst us can lay his hand on his heart and say that a peace which would have roused the indignation even of our commercial and comparatively pacific people might not so have mortified the pride of that nation of soldiers to which the name of Napoleon was the title-deed to empire, as to have shaken the stability of a throne which now seems essential to the safety and social order of the civilized globe?

“Oh,” says the right honorable gentleman the member for the University of Oxford, with a solecism in logic which I could never have expected from so acute a reasoner, “see how Russia has come down to terms which she before so contemptuously scouted. In February, 1853, she declared such and such terms were incompatible with her honor; she would

dictate terms to Turkey only at St. Petersburg, under the frown of the Czar, or at the headquarters of the Russian camp; and now see how mild and equitable Russia has become."

Yes; but how was that change effected? By diplomacy and negotiations? By notes and protocols? No—these had been tried in vain; the result of these was the levying of armaments—the seizure of provinces—the massacre of Sinope. That change was effected by the sword—effected in those fields of Alma and Inkerman to which the right honorable gentleman so touchingly appealed—effected by those military successes inspired by the passion for fame and glory on which, as principles of action, his humanity is so bitterly sarcastic. The right honorable gentleman dwelt in a Christian spirit, which moved us all, on the gallant blood that had been shed by us, our allies, and even by our foes in this unhappy quarrel. But did it never occur to him that all the while he was speaking this question was irresistibly forcing itself on the minds of his English audience:

"And shall all this blood have been shed in vain? Was it merely to fertilize the soil of the Crimea with human bones? And shall we, who have buried two thirds of our army, still leave a fortress at Sebastopol and a Russian fleet in the Black Sea, eternally to menace the independence of that ally whom our heroes have perished to protect?"

And would not that blood have been shed in vain? Talk of recent negotiations effecting the object for which you commenced the war! Let us strip those negotiations of diplomatic quibbles and look at them like men of common sense. Do not let gentlemen be alarmed lest I should weary them with going at length over such hackneyed ground—two minutes will suffice.

The direct question involved is to terminate the preponderance of Russia in the Black Sea; and with this is involved another question—to put an end to the probabilities of renewed war arising out of the position which Russia would henceforth occupy in those waters. Now, the first proposition of Russia is to open to all ships the passage of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. “That is the right thing,” says the right honorable member for Manchester.

Yes, so it would be if Russia had not the whole of that coast bristling with fortresses; but while these fortresses remain it is simply to say: Let Russia increase as she pleases the maritime forces she can direct against Turkey, sheltered by all the strongholds she has established on the coasts, and let France and England keep up, if they please, the perpetual surveillance of naval squadrons in a sea, as the note of a French minister well expresses it, “where they could find neither a port of refuge nor an arsenal of supply.”

This does not, on the one hand, diminish the preponderance of Russia; it only says you may, at great expense, and with great disadvantages, keep standing navies to guard against its abuse; and on the other hand, far from putting an end to the probabilities of war, it leaves the fleets of Russia perpetually threatening Turkey, and the fleets of England and France perpetually threatening Russia. And while such a position could hardly fail sooner or later to create jealousy between England and France, I can scarcely imagine any disease that would more rot away the independence of Turkey than this sort of chronic protection established in her own waters.

The second proposition, which retains the *mare clausum*, not only leaves the preponderance of Russia exactly what it was before the war began, but, in granting to the Sultan the

power to summon his allies at any moment he may require them, exposes you to the fresh outbreak of hostilities whenever the Sultan might even needlessly take alarm; but with these differences between your present and future position: first, that Russia would then be strengthened and you might be unprepared; and next, that while, as I said before, now not one Russian flag can show itself on those waters, you might then, before you could enter the Straits, find that flag waving in triumph over the walls of the Seraglio.

And to prove that this is no imaginary danger just hear what is said upon the subject by the practical authority of Marshal Marmont, which was loosely referred to the other night by the noble lord the member for London [Lord John Russell], and remember the Marshal is speaking at a period when the force of Russia in those parts was far inferior to what it would be now if you acceded to her terms: "At Sebastopol Russia has twelve sail of the line, perfectly armed and equipped." Let me here observe that the Marshal recommends that this number should be increased to thirty, and says that if Sebastopol were made the harbor of a powerful navy nothing could prevent Russia from imposing laws on the Mediterranean—

"In the immediate neighborhood a division of the army is cantoned; it could embark in two days and in three more reach Constantinople—the distance between Sebastopol and the Bosphorus being 180 miles, and a speedy passage almost a matter of certainty, owing to the prevalence of northerly winds and the constant current from the Euxine toward the Sea of Marmora. Thus, on the apprehension of interference from the allied fleet, that of Russia would pass and take up such a position as circumstances might dictate, while an army of 60,000 men would cross the Danube, pass the Balkan, and place itself at Adrianople; these movements

being effected with such promptitude and facility that no circumstances whatever could prevent their being carried into execution."

And now I put it to the candor of those distinguished advocates for the Russian proposals, whose sincerity I am sure is worthy of their character and talents, whether the obvious result of both these propositions for peace is not to keep your powers in the unrelaxing attitude of war—one of those powers always goaded on by cupidity and ambition, the other three always agitated by jealousy and suspicion? And is it on such a barrel of gunpowder as this that you would ask the world to fall asleep? But, say the honorable gentlemen, "The demand of the western powers on the third article is equally inadequate to effect the object."

Well, I think there they have very much proved their case, very much proved how fortunate it was that negotiations were broken off. However when a third point is to be raised again let us clear it of all difficulties and raise it not in a Congress of Vienna but within the walls of Sebastopol.

Sir, before I pass from this part of the subject let me respectfully address one suggestion to those earnest and distinguished reasoners who would make peace their paramount object. You desire peace as soon as possible; do you think you take the right way to obtain it? Do you think that when Russia can say, "Here are members of the very government who commenced the war declaring that our moderation has removed all ground for further hostilities; they are backed by the most conspicuous leaders of the popular party; the representatives of those great manufacturing interests which so often influence, and sometimes control, the councils of a commercial State;" do you think that Russia will not add

also: "These are signs that encourage us, the Russian Empire, to prosecute the war; they are signs that our enemy foresees the speedy exhaustion of its means, the relaxing ardor of its people, and must, after some bravado, accept the terms which are recommended in the National Assembly by experienced statesmen and popular tribunes"?

You are leading Russia to deceive herself, to deceive her subjects. You are encouraging her to hold out, and every speech you make in such a strain a Russian general might read to his troops, a Russian minister might translate to trembling merchants and beggared nobles, if he desired to animate them all to new exertions against your country. I do not wish to malign and misrepresent you. I respect the courage with which you avow unpopular opinions. I know you are patriots as sincere as we are. You have proved your attachment to the abstract principle of freedom; but do you reflect whether you make a right exercise of your powers if, when we are sending our sons and kinsmen to assist a cause which would at least secure weakness from oppression, and the free development of one nation from the brute force of another, you take the part of the enemy against your country? [Mr. M. Gibson: "No, no!"] "No, no?"

What means that denial? You take part with the enemy when you say he is in the right, and against your country when you say we are in the wrong. You transfer from our cause to his that consciousness of superior justice which gives ardor to the lukewarm, endurance to the hesitating, and by vindicating his quarrel you invigorate his arms.

If I now turn to the amendments before the House, I know not one that I can thoroughly approve; not, of course, that by the honorable member for the University of Oxford [Sir William Heathcote], not that of the honorable member for

Kidderminster [Mr. Robert Lowe]; for I feel no regret that Russia should not have terminated hostilities by accepting proposals inadequate in my judgment to secure our object; while I think it scarcely consistent with the prerogative of the Crown, and might furnish a dangerous precedent hereafter, if we were to contest the right of her Majesty to judge for herself whether the means of peace on the basis of the Third Negotiation are exhausted or not.

The amendment of the right honorable member for Portsmouth [Sir F. Baring] would have been more complimentary to the quarter whence he stole it if he had not added the crime of murder to that of theft. He takes an infant from the paternal cradle, cuts it in half, and the head which he presents to us has no longer a leg to stand upon. The original motion of my right honorable friend the member for Buckinghamshire [Mr. Disraeli], in censuring the government for ambiguous language and uncertain conduct, gave a substantial reason for conveying to her Majesty that we, at least, would support her in the conduct of war. Omit that censure, imply by your silence that there is no reason to distrust her Majesty's responsible advisers, and the rest of the resolution becomes an unmeaning platitude.

It is with great satisfaction that I think of the effect produced by the original motion of my right honorable friend; for to my mind that effect atones for its want of success in meeting with the sanction of the House. It has not, it is true, changed the government, but it assuredly has changed its tone. I do not know whether that change will be lasting, but I hope that we are not to take, as a test of the earnestness of a government thus suddenly galvanized into vigor the speech of the noble lord the member for London [Lord John Russell], which, before the division, implied so much,

but which, after the division, was explained away in so remarkable a manner. I rejoice that in wringing direct declarations from the government it leaves us free to discuss that which is before us, not as Englishmen against Englishmen, but as citizens of one common state equally interested in surveying the grounds of a common danger.

Much reference has been made in the course of this debate as to the position of Austria. The mediation of Austria is withdrawn for the present, but Austria is still there, always ready to mediate as long as she hesitates to act. It is well to consider what may be our position with regard to a power with which we have constantly been brought into contact. I cannot too earnestly entreat you to distinguish with Austria and the alliance with Austria. I think it is of the utmost importance, if you would confine this war within compact and definite limits, that you should maintain friendly terms with a power which, as long as it is neutral, if it cannot serve does not harm you, and which you could not seriously injure without casting out of the balance of Europe one of the weights most necessary to the equilibrium of the scales.

It is easy to threaten Austria with the dismemberment of her ill-cemented empire, easy to threaten her with reduction to a fourth-rate power. But she has this answer to the practical sagacity of England and the chivalrous moderation of France: "Is the empire of Austria not less essential as a counterpoise to France than the integrity of Turkey is essential as a barrier against Russia? If the balance of power be not a mere dream, I trust my cause to every statesman by whom the balance of power is respected."

But though, for this and for other reasons, I would desire you to maintain friendly relations with Austria, pardon me if I doubt the wisdom of having so earnestly solicited

her alliance. Supposing you had now gained it, what would you have done? Just what a government here might do if it pressed into its cabinet some able and influential man with views not congenial to its own, and who used his power on your councils to modify the opinions and check the plans upon which you had before been united.

Add Austria now, while she is still timid and reluctant, to the two western powers, give her a third co-equal voice in all the conduct of the war, and it could only introduce into their councils a certain element of vacillation and discord. But if you bide your time, preserving Austria in her present attitude of friendly neutrality, if you do not threaten and affront her into action against you, the natural consequences of continued war, the common inclinations of her statesmen and her people—which I have reason to know are not favorable to Russia—will bring her to you at length with coincidence in your objects, because according to the dictates of her own sense of self-interest.

As far as I can judge, our tone with Austria has been much too supplicating and our mode of arguing with her somewhat ludicrous. It reminds me of the story of an American who saw making up to him in the woods an enormous bear. Upon that he betook himself to his devotions and exclaimed, "O Lord, there is going to be a horrible fight between me and the bear. All I seek is fair play and no favor. If there is justice in heaven, you ought to help me; but if you won't help me, don't help the bear."

But now comes the grave and solemn problem which the withdrawal of all negotiations forces still more upon the mind of every one who thinks deeply, and which the right honorable gentleman the member from Manchester has so properly raised. War being fairly upon us, of what nature shall

be that war? Shall it assume that vast and comprehensive character which excites in the honorable member for Aylesbury [Mr. Layard] hopes for the human race too daring even for him to detail to this sober House?

In plain words, shall it be a war in which, to use the language of Mr. Canning in 1826, you will enlist "all those who, whether justly or unjustly, are dissatisfied with their own countries;" in which you will imitate the spirit of revolutionary France when she swept over Europe and sought to reconcile humanity to slaughter by pointing to a rainbow of freedom on the other side of the deluge? Does history here give to the honorable member an example or a warning? How were these promises fulfilled? Look round Europe! You had the carnage—where is the freedom? The deluge spread, the deluge rolled away—half a century is fled and where is the rainbow visible? Is it on the ruins of Cracow? on the field of Novara? or over the walls of defeated Rome?

No; in a war that invokes liberal opinion against established rules, what I most dread and deprecate is, not that you will fulfil your promises and reap the republics for which you sowed rebellions; what I dread far more is that all such promises would in the end be broken—that the hopes of liberty would be betrayed—that the moment the monarchies of England and France could obtain a peace that realized the objects for which monarchs go to war, they would feel themselves compelled by the exhaustion of their resources, by the instincts of self-conservatism, to abandon the auxiliaries they had lured into revolution—restore to despotism "the right divine to govern wrong," and furnish with it new excuse for vigilance and rigor by the disorders which always distinguish armed revolution from peaceable reforms.

I say nothing here against the fair possibility of reconstructing in some future congress the independence of Poland, or such territorial arrangements as are comprised in the question, "What is to be done in the Crimea, provided we take it?"

But these are not all that is meant by the language we hear, less vaguely out of this House than in it, except when a minister implies what he shrinks from explaining. And woe and shame to the English statesman who, whatever may be his sympathy for oppressed subjects, shall rouse them to rebellion against their native thrones, not foreseeing that in the changes of popular representative government all that his cabinet may promise to-day a new cabinet to-morrow may legally revoke; that he has no power to redeem in freedom the pledges that he writes in blood! And woe still more to brave populations that are taught to rest democracy on the arms of foreign soldiers, the fickle cheers of foreign popular assemblies, or to dream that liberty can never be received as a gift, extorted as a right, maintained as a hereditary heirloom, except the charter be obtained at their own Runnymede and signed under the shadow of their own oaks!

But there is all the difference between rousing nations against their rulers and securing the independence and integrity of a weak nation against a powerful neighbor. The first is a policy that submits the destinies of a country to civil discord, the other relieves those destinies from foreign interference; the one tends to vain and indefinite warfare—the other starts, at the outset, with intelligible conditions of peace.

Therefore in this war let us strictly keep to the object for which it was begun—the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire, secured by all the guaranties which states-

men can desire or victory enable us to demand. The more definite the object the more firm you will be in asserting it.

How the object is to be effected, how these securities are to be obtained, is not the affair of the House of Commons. The strategy must be planned by the allied cabinets, and its execution entrusted to councils of war. We in this House can only judge by results; and, however unfair that may seem to governments, it is the sole course left to us, unless we are always dictating to our allies and hampering our generals. But we thus make the end of the war purely protective; we cannot make the means we adopt purely defensive. In order to force Russia into our object we must assail and cripple her wherever she can be crippled and assailed. I say, with the right honorable gentleman the member for the University of Oxford, do not offer to her an idle insult, do not slap her in the face, but paralyze her hands.

"Oh," said a noble friend of mine the other night [Lord Stanley], "it is a wretched policy to humble the foe that you cannot crush; and are you mad enough to suppose that Russia can be crushed?"

Let my noble friend, in the illustrious career which I venture to prophesy lies before him, beware how he ever endeavors to contract the grand science of statesmen into scholastic aphorisms. No, we cannot crush Russia as Russia, but we can crush her attempts to be more than Russia. We can, and we must, crush any means that enable her to storm or to steal across that tangible barrier which now divides Europe from a power that supports the maxims of Machiavelli with the armaments of Britain.

You might as well have said to William of Orange, "You cannot crush Louis XIV; how impolitic you are to humble him!" You might as well have said to the burghers of

Switzerland, "You cannot crush Austria; don't vainly insult her by limiting her privilege to crush yourselves."

William of Orange did not crush France as a kingdom; Switzerland did not crush Austria as an empire; but William did crush the power of France to injure Holland; Switzerland did crush the power of Austria to enslave her people; and in that broad sense of the word, by the blessing of heaven, we will crush the power of Russia to invade her neighbors and convulse the world.

The right honorable gentleman the member for Manchester has sought to frighten us by dwelling on the probable duration of this war; but if you will only be in earnest, and if you will limit yourselves strictly to its legitimate object, I have no fear that the war will be long. I do not presume on our recent successes, important though they are, for Kertch is the *entrepôt* of all the commerce of the Sea of Azof; nor on the exaggerated estimate of the forces which Russia has in Sebastopol or can bring to the Crimea; nor on her difficulty through any long series of campaigns to transport and provision large armies from great distances; nor on many circumstances which, of late especially, tend to show that for exertions at once violent and sustained her sinews are not strong enough to support her bulk.

But I look only to the one fact, that in these days war is money; and that no power on earth can carry on a long war with a short purse. Russia's pecuniary resources are fast failing her. In no country is recruiting so costly or attended with such distress to the proprietors of the soil. Every new levy, in depriving the nobles of their serfs, leaves poverty and discontent behind; while in arresting her commercial intercourse, you exhaust the only springs that can recruit the capital which she robs from the land. In the great "History of

Treaties," now publishing by the Count de Garden, and which must supersede all other authorities on that subject, he speaks thus of Russia in 1810:

"The closing of her ports, which was the result of her war with England, deprived Russia of all outlet for her exportations, which, consisting chiefly of raw materials, such as timber, potash, iron, etc., could only be transported by sea. The balance of commerce thus fixed itself entirely to the detriment of Russia, and producing there a disastrous fall in the course of exchange and a depreciation of the currency, menaced with ruin all the financial resources of the State."


You have therefore always at work for you, not only your fleets and armies, but the vital interests of Russia herself. She cannot resist you long, provided you are thoroughly in earnest. She may boast and dissimulate to the last, but rely on it that peace will come to you suddenly—will, in her proper name, knock loudly at the door which you do not close against peace herself, but against her felonious counterfeit who would creep through the opening disguised in her garments and with the sword concealed under her veil.

The noble lord who has just spoken with so much honesty of conviction [Lord Archibald Hamilton] ventured to anticipate the verdict of history. Let me do the same. Let me suppose that when the future philanthropist shall ask what service on the human race did we in our generation signally confer, some one—trained perhaps in the schools of Oxford, or in the Institute of Manchester—shall answer:

"A power that commanded myriads—as many as those that under Xerxes exhausted rivers in their march—embodied all the forces of barbarism on the outskirts of civilization. Left there to develop its own natural resources, no State molested, though all apprehended, its growth. But, long pent by merciful nature in its own legitimate domains,

this power schemed for the outlet to its instinctive ambition. To that outlet it crept by dissimulating guile, by successive treaties that, promising peace, graduated spoliation to the opportunities of fraud. At length, under pretexts too gross to deceive the common sense of mankind, it prepared to seize that outlet—to storm the feeble gates between itself and the world beyond.”

Then the historian shall say that we in our generation—the united families of England and France—made ourselves the vanguard of alarmed and shrinking Europe, and did not sheathe the sword until we had redeemed the pledge to humanity made on the faith of two Christian sovereigns, and ratified at those distant graves which liberty and justice shall revere forever.



RALPH WALDO EMERSON

RALPH WALDO EMERSON



ALPH WALDO EMERSON, distinguished American poet, lecturer, and essayist, was born at Boston, May 25, 1803, and died at Concord, Mass., April 27, 1882. His father, the Rev. William Emerson, was a man of considerable parts, and, during his brief ministry at Boston, a leader in the intellectual and social life of the city. The son graduated from Harvard College, in 1821, studied at the Divinity School, and, after teaching in various places, became minister of the Second Unitarian Church at Boston. For a year after resigning his Boston pastorate he travelled in Europe and began an intimacy with Carlyle, which lasted for nearly two-score years and resulted in a large mass of published correspondence, unique in its varied intellectual interest. On his return to America he lectured, wrote poems and essays, and occasionally preached. Having decided not to accept any definite pastorate, he settled at Concord, Mass., which was his home for the remainder of his life. In 1836, he published a volume of essays, entitled "Nature," which some critics still consider the most original work, though perhaps too philosophical, that America has as yet produced. In 1849, he revisited England and delivered a series of lectures on "Representative Men." His collected writings are published in eleven volumes: I, "Nature: Addresses and Lectures"; II, III, "Essays"; IV, "Representative Men"; V, "English Traits"; VI, "The Conduct of Life"; VII, "Society and Solitude"; VIII, "Letters and Social Aims"; IX, "Poems"; X, "Lectures and Biographical Sketches"; XI, "Miscellanies." Emerson is regarded as, on the whole, the most distinguished man of letters of his country. His influence has been great; his depth of thought, imagination, grace of style, and originality of expression being highly stimulative as well as scholarly.

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR

AN ORATION DELIVERED BEFORE THE PHI BETA KAPPA SOCIETY, AT CAMBRIDGE, MASS., AUGUST 31, 1837

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN,—I greet you on the recommencement of our literary year. Our anniversary is one of hope, and perhaps not enough of labor. We do not meet for games of strength or skill, for the recitation of histories, tragedies, and odes, like the ancient

Greeks; for parliaments of love and poesy, like the Troubadours; nor for the advancement of science, like our contemporaries in the British and European capitals. Thus far our holiday has been simply a friendly sign of the survival of the love of letters amongst a people too busy to give to letters any more. As such it is precious as the sign of an indestructible instinct. Perhaps the time has already come when it ought to be and will be something else; when the sluggish intellect of this continent will look from under its iron lids and fill the postponed expectation of the world with something better than the exertions of mechanical skill. Our day of dependence, our long apprenticeship to the learning of other lands, draws to a close. The millions that around us are rushing into life cannot always be fed on the sere remains of foreign harvests. Events, actions arise, that must be sung, that will sing themselves. Who can doubt that poetry will revive and lead in a new age, as the star in the constellation Harp, which now flames in our zenith, astronomers announce, shall one day be the pole-star for a thousand years?

In this hope I accept the topic which not only usage, but the nature of our association, seem to prescribe to this day—the American Scholar. Year by year we come up hither to read one more chapter of his biography. Let us inquire what light new days and events have thrown on his character and his hopes.

It is one of those fables which, out of an unknown antiquity, convey an unlooked-for wisdom, that the gods in the beginning divided Man into men, that he might be more helpful to himself; just as the hand was divided into fingers, the better to answer its end.

The old fable covers a doctrine ever new and sublime;

that there is One Man—present to all particular men only partially, or through one faculty; and that you must take the whole society to find the whole man. Man is not a farmer, or professor, or an engineer, but he is all. Man is priest, and scholar, and statesman, and producer, and soldier. In the divided or social state these functions are parcelled out to individuals, each of whom aims to do his stint of the joint work, whilst each other performs his. The fable implies, that the individual to possess himself must sometimes return from his own labor to embrace all the other laborers. But unfortunately, this original unit, this fountain of power, has been so distributed to multitudes, has been so minutely subdivided and peddled out, that it is spilled into drops, and cannot be gathered. The state of society is one in which the members have suffered amputation from the trunk, and strut about, so many walking monsters—a good finger, a neck, a stomach, an elbow, but never a man.

Man is thus metamorphosed into a thing, into many things. The planter, who is Man sent out into the field to gather food, is seldom cheered by any idea of the true dignity of his ministry. He sees his bushel and his cart, and nothing beyond, and sinks into the farmer, instead of Man on the farm. The tradesman scarcely ever gives an ideal worth to his work, but is ridden by the routine of his craft and the soul is subject to dollars. The priest becomes a form; the attorney, a statute book; the mechanic, a machine; the sailor, a rope of a ship.

In this distribution of functions the scholar is the delegated intellect. In the right state he is Man Thinking. In the degenerate state, when the victim of society, he tends to become a mere thinker, or, still worse, the parrot of other men's thinking.

In this view of him, as Man Thinking, the theory of his office is contained. Him nature solicits with all her placid, all her monitory pictures; him the past instructs; him the future invites. Is not, indeed, every man a student, and do not all things exist for the student's behoof? And finally is not the true scholar the only true master? But the old oracle said, "All things have two handles: beware of the wrong one." In life too often the scholar errs with mankind and forfeits his privilege. Let us see him in his school and consider him in reference to the main influences he receives.

I. The first in time and the first in importance of the influences upon the mind is that of nature. Every day, the sun; and after sunset, night and her stars. Ever the winds blow; ever the grass grows. Every day men and women conversing, beholding and beholden. The scholar is he of all men whom this spectacle most engages. He must settle its value in his mind. What is nature to him? There is never a beginning, there is never an end to the inexplicable continuity of this web of God, but always circular power returning into itself. Therein it resembles his own spirit, whose beginning, whose ending, he never can find—so entire, so boundless. Far, too, as her splendors shine, system on system shooting like rays, upward, downward, without centre, without circumference—in the mass and in the particle nature hastens to render account of herself to the mind. Classification begins. To the young mind everything is individual, stands by itself. By and by it finds how to join two things and see in them one nature, then three, then three thousand; and so, tyrannized over by its own unifying instinct, it goes on tying things together, diminishing anomalies, discovering roots running under ground, whereby contrary and remote

things cohere and flower out from one stem. It presently learns that since the dawn of history there has been a constant accumulation and classifying of facts. But what is classification but the perceiving that these objects are not chaotic and are not foreign, but have a law which is also a law of the human mind? The astronomer discovers that geometry, a pure abstraction of the human mind, is the measure of planetary motion. The chemist finds proportions and intelligible method throughout matter; and science is nothing but the finding of analogy, identity, in the most remote parts. The ambitious soul sits down before each refractory fact; one after another, reduces all strange constitutions, all new powers, to their class and their law, and goes on forever to animate the last fibre of organization, the outskirts of nature, by insight.

Thus to him, to this school-boy under the bending dome of day, is suggested that he and it proceed from one root; one is leaf and one is flower; relation, sympathy, stirring in every vein. And what is that Root? Is not that the soul of his soul?—a thought too bold,—a dream too wild. Yet when this spiritual light shall have revealed the law of more earthly natures,—when he has learned to worship the soul, and to see that the natural philosophy that now is, is only the first gropings of its gigantic hand, he shall look forward to an ever expanding knowledge as to a becoming creator. He shall see that nature is the opposite of the soul, answering to it part for part. One is seal and one is print. Its beauty is the beauty of his own mind. Its laws are the laws of his own mind. Nature then becomes to him the measure of his attainments. So much of nature as he is ignorant of, so much of his own mind does he not yet possess. And in fine the ancient precept, “Know thyself,”

and the modern precept, "Study nature," become at last one maxim.

II. The next great influence into the spirit of the scholar is the mind of the Past,—in whatever form, whether of literature, of art, of institutions, that mind is inscribed. Books are the best type of the influence of the past, and perhaps we shall get at the truth,—learn the amount of this influence more conveniently,—by considering their value alone.

The theory of books is noble. The scholar of the first age received into him the world around; brooded thereon; gave it the new arrangement of his own mind and uttered it again. It came into him, life; it went out from him, truth. It came to him, short-lived actions; it went out from him, immortal thoughts. It came to him, business; it went from him, poetry. It was dead fact; now, it is quick thought. It can stand and it can go. It now endures, it now flies, it now inspires. Precisely in proportion to the depth of mind from which it issued, so high does it soar, so long does it sing.

Or, I might say, it depends on how far the process had gone, of transmuting life into truth. In proportion to the completeness of the distillation, so will the purity and imperishableness of the product be. But none is quite perfect. As no air-pump can by any means make a perfect vacuum, so neither can any artist entirely exclude the conventional, the local, the perishable from his book, or write a book of pure thought, that shall be as efficient, in all respects, to a remote posterity, as to cotemporaries, or rather to the second age. Each age, it is found, must write its own books; or rather, each generation for the next succeeding. The books of an older period will not fit this.

Yet hence arises a grave mischief. The sacredness which

attaches to the act of creation,—the act of thought,—is transferred to the record. The poet chanting, was felt to be a divine man: henceforth the chant is divine also. The writer was a just and wise spirit: henceforward it is settled, the book is perfect; as love of the hero corrupts into worship of his statue. Instantly the book becomes noxious: the guide is a tyrant. The sluggish and perverted mind of the multitude, slow to open to the incursions of Reason, having once so opened, having once received this book, stands upon it and makes an outcry if it is disparaged. Colleges are built on it. Books are written on it by thinkers, not by Man Thinking; by men of talent, that is, who start wrong, who set out from accepted dogmas, not from their own sight of principles. Meek young men grow up in libraries, believing it their duty to accept the views which Cicero, which Locke, which Bacon have given, forgetful that Cicero, Locke, and Bacon were only young men in libraries when they wrote these books.

Hence, instead of Man Thinking, we have the bookworm. Hence, the book-learned class who value books, as such; not as related to nature and the human constitution, but as making a sort of Third Estate with the world and the soul. Hence, the restorers of readings, the emendators, the bibliomaniacs of all degrees.

Books are the best of things, well used; abused, among the worst. What is the right use? What is the one end, which all means go to effect? They are for nothing but to inspire. I had better never see a book than to be warped by its attraction clean out of my own orbit and made a satellite instead of a system. The one thing in the world of value is the active soul. This every man is entitled to; this every man contains within him, although, in almost all men, ob-

structed, and as yet unborn. The soul active sees absolute truth; and utters truth, or creates. In this action, it is genius; not the privilege of here and there a favorite, but the sound estate of every man. In its essence, it is progressive. The book, the college, the school of art, the institution of any kind, stop with some past utterance of genius. This is good, say they,—let us hold by this. They pin me down. They look backward and not forward. But genius looks forward: the eyes of man are set in his forehead, not in his hindhead; man hopes, genius creates. Whatever talents may be, if the man create not, the pure efflux of the Deity is not his; cinders and smoke there maybe, but not yet flame. There are creative manners, there are creative actions, and creative words; manners, actions, words, that is, indicative of no custom or authority, but springing spontaneous from the mind's own sense of good and fair.

On the other part, instead of being its own seer, let it receive from another mind its truth, though it were in torrents of light, without periods of solitude, inquest, and self-recovery, and a fatal disservice is done. Genius is always sufficiently the enemy of genius by over-influence. The literature of every nation bear me witness. The English dramatic poets have Shakspearized now for two hundred years.

Undoubtedly there is a right way of reading, so it be sternly subordinated. Man Thinking must not be subdued by his instruments. Books are for the scholar's idle times. When he can read God directly, the hour is too precious to be wasted in other men's transcripts of their readings. But when the intervals of darkness come, as come they must,—when the sun is hid, and the stars withdraw their shining,—we repair to the lamps which were kindled by their ray, to

guide our steps to the East again, where the dawn is. We hear, that we may speak. The Arabian proverb says, "A fig-tree, looking on a fig-tree, becomes fruitful."

It is remarkable, the character of the pleasure we derive from the best books. They impress us with the conviction, that one nature wrote and the same reads. We read the verses of one of the great English poets, of Chaucer, of Marvell, of Dryden, with the most modern joy,—with a pleasure, I mean, which is in great part caused by the abstraction of all time from their verses. There is some awe mixed with the joy of our surprise, when this poet, who lived in some past world, two or three hundred years ago, says that which lies close to my own soul, that which I also had wellnigh thought and said. But for the evidence thence afforded to the philosophical doctrine of the identity of all minds, we should suppose some pre-established harmony, some foresight of souls that were to be, and some preparation of stores for their future wants, like the fact observed in insects, who lay up food before death for the young grub they shall never see.

I would not be hurried by any love of system, by any exaggeration of instincts, to underrate the Book. We all know that, as the human body can be nourished on any food, though it were boiled grass and the broth of shoes, so the human mind can be fed by any knowledge. And great and heroic men have existed who had almost no other information than by the printed page. I only would say, that it needs a strong head to bear that diet. One must be an inventor to read well. As the proverb says, "He that would bring home the wealth of the Indies, must carry out the wealth of the Indies." There is, then, creative reading as well as creative writing. When the mind is braced by labor and invention, the page of

Lenoir Rhyme College
LIBRARY

whatever book we read becomes luminous with manifold allusion. Every sentence is doubly significant, and the sense of our author is as broad as the world. We then see, what is always true, that, as the seer's hour of vision is short and rare among heavy days and months, so is its record, perchance, the least part of his volume. The discerning will read, in his Plato or Shakespeare, only that least part,—only the authentic utterances of the oracle; all the rest he rejects, were it never so many times Plato's and Shakespeare's.

Of course there is a portion of reading quite indispensable to a wise man. History and exact science he must learn by laborious reading. Colleges, in like manner, have their indispensable office,—to teach elements. But they can only highly serve us when they aim not to drill, but to create; when they gather from far every ray of various genius to their hospitable halls, and, by the concentrated fires, set the hearts of their youth on flame. Thought and knowledge are natures in which apparatus and pretension avail nothing. Gowns and pecuniary foundations, though of towns of gold, can never countervail the least sentence or syllable of wit. Forget this, and our American colleges will recede in their public importance, whilst they grow richer every year.

III. There goes in the world a notion that the scholar should be a recluse, a valetudinarian,—as unfit for any handiwork or public labor as a penknife for an axe. The so-called "practical men" sneer at speculative men as if, because they speculate or see, they could do nothing. I have heard it said that the clergy,—who are always, more universally than any other class, the scholars of their day,—are addressed as women; that the rough, spontaneous conversation of men they do not hear, but only a mincing and diluted speech. They are often virtually disfranchised; and, indeed, there are ad-

vocates for their celibacy. As far as this is true of the studious classes, it is not just and wise. Action is with the scholar subordinate, but it is essential. Without it, he is not yet man. Without it, thought can never ripen into truth. Whilst the world hangs before the eye as a cloud of beauty, we cannot even see its beauty. Inaction is cowardice, but there can be no scholar without the heroic mind. The preamble of thought, the transition through which it passes from the unconscious to the conscious, is action. Only so much do I know as I have lived. Instantly we know whose words are loaded with life, and whose not.

The world,—this shadow of the soul, or *other me*, lies wide around. Its attractions are the keys which unlock my thoughts and make me acquainted with myself. I run eagerly into this resounding tumult. I grasp the hands of those next me, and take my place in the ring to suffer and to work, taught by an instinct, that so shall the dumb abyss be vocal with speech. I pierce its order; I dissipate its fear; I dispose of it within the circuit of my expanding life. So much only of life as I know by experience, so much of the wilderness have I vanquished and planted, or so far have I extended my being, my dominion. I do not see how any man can afford, for the sake of his nerves and his nap, to spare any action in which he can partake. It is pearls and rubies to his discourse. Drudgery, calamity, exasperation, want, are instructors in eloquence and wisdom. The true scholar grudges every opportunity of action past by as a loss of power.

It is the raw material out of which the intellect moulds her splendid products. A strange process too, this, by which experience is converted into thought, as a mulberry leaf is converted into satin. The manufacture goes forward at all hours.

The actions and events of our childhood and youth are now matters of calmest observation. They lie like fair pictures in the air. Not so with our recent actions,—with the business which we now have in hand. On this we are quite unable to speculate. Our affections as yet circulate through it. We no more feel or know it than we feel the feet or the hand or the brain of our body. The new deed is yet a part of life,—remains for a time immersed in our unconscious life. In some contemplative hour, it detaches itself from the life like a ripe fruit, to become a thought of the mind. Instantly, it is raised, transfigured; the corruptible has put on incorruption. Henceforth it is an object of beauty, however base its origin and neighborhood. Observe, too, the impossibility of antedating this act. In its grub state it cannot fly, it cannot shine, it is a dull grub. But suddenly, without observation, the selfsame thing unfurls beautiful wings and is an angel of wisdom. So is there no fact, no event in our private history, which shall not, sooner or later, lose its adhesive, inert form, and astonish us by soaring from our body into the empyrean. Cradle and infancy, school and playground, the fear of boys, and dogs, and ferules, the love of little maids and berries, and many another fact that once filled the whole sky, are gone already; friend and relative, profession and party, town and country, nation and world, must also soar and sing.

Of course he who has put forth his total strength in fit actions has the richest return of wisdom. I will not shut myself out of this globe of action and transplant an oak into a flower-pot, there to hunger and pine; nor trust the revenue of some single faculty, and exhaust one vein of thought, much like those Savoyards, who, getting their livelihood by carving shepherds, shepherdesses, and smoking Dutchmen,

for all Europe, went out one day to the mountain to find stock and discovered that they had whittled up the last of their pine-trees. Authors we have in numbers who have written out their vein, and who, moved by a commendable prudence, sail for Greece or Palestine, follow the trapper into the prairie, or ramble around Algiers, to replenish their merchantable stock.

If it were only for a vocabulary, the scholar would be covetous of action. Life is our dictionary. Years are well spent in country labors; in town, in the insight into trades and manufactures; in frank intercourse with many men and women; in science; in art; to the one end of mastering in all their facts a language by which to illustrate and embody our perceptions. I learn immediately from any speaker how much he has already lived, through the poverty or the splendor of his speech. Life lies behind us as the quarry from whence we get tiles and cope-stones for the masonry of to-day. This is the way to learn grammar. Colleges and books only copy the language which the field and the work-yard made.

But the final value of action, like that of books, and better than books, is, that it is a resource. That great principle of Undulation in nature that shows itself in the inspiring and expiring of the breath; in desire and satiety; in the ebb and flow of the sea; in day and night; in heat and cold; and as yet more deeply ingrained in every atom and every fluid, is known to us under the name of Polarity,—these “fits of easy transmission and reflection,” as Newton called them, are the law of nature because they are the law of spirit.

The mind now thinks; now acts; and each fit reproduces the other. When the artist has exhausted his materials, when the fancy no longer paints, when thoughts are no longer ap-

prehended, and books are a weariness,—he has always the resource to live. Character is higher than intellect. Thinking is the function. Living is the functionary. The stream retreats to its source. A great soul will be strong to live, as well as strong to think. Does he lack organ or medium to impart his truths? He can still fall back on this elemental force of living them. This is a total act. Thinking is a partial act. Let the grandeur of justice shine in his affairs. Let the beauty of affection cheer his lowly roof. Those “far from fame,” who dwell and act with him, will feel the force of his constitution in the doings and passages of the day better than it can be measured by any public and designed display. Time shall teach him that the scholar loses no hour which the man lives. Herein he unfolds the sacred germ of his instinct, screened from influence. What is lost in seemliness is gained in strength. Not out of those on whom systems of education have exhausted their culture comes the helpful giant to destroy the old or to build the new, but out of unhandselled savage nature, out of terrible Druids and berserkirs, come at last Alfred and Shakespeare.

I hear, therefore, with joy whatever is beginning to be said of the dignity and necessity of labor to every citizen. There is virtue yet in the hoe and the spade, for learned as well as for unlearned hands. And labor is everywhere welcome; always we are invited to work; only be this limitation observed, that a man shall not for the sake of wider activity sacrifice any opinion to the popular judgments and modes of action.

I have now spoken of the education of the scholar by nature, by books, and by action. It remains to say somewhat of his duties.

They are such as become Man Thinking. They may all be comprised in self-trust. The office of the scholar is to

cheer, to raise, and to guide men by showing them facts amidst appearances. He plies the slow, unhonored, and unpaid task of observation. Flamsteed and Herschel, in their glazed observatories, may catalogue the stars with the praise of all men, and, the results being splendid and useful, honor is sure. But he, in his private observatory, cataloguing obscure and nebulous stars of the human mind, which as yet no man has thought of as such,—watching days and months, sometimes, for a few facts; correcting still his old records;—must relinquish display and immediate fame. In the long period of his preparation he must betray often an ignorance and shiftlessness in popular arts, incurring the disdain of the able who shoulder him aside. Long he must stammer in his speech; often forego the living for the dead. Worse yet, he must accept,—how often! poverty and solitude. For the ease and pleasure of treading the old road, accepting the fashions, the education, the religion of society, he takes the cross of making his own, and, of course, the self-accusation, the faint heart, the frequent uncertainty and loss of time, which are the nettles and tangling vines in the way of the self-relying and self-directed; and the state of virtual hostility in which he seems to stand to society, and especially to educated society. For all this loss and scorn, what offset? He is to find consolation in exercising the highest functions of human nature. He is one who raises himself from private considerations, and breathes and lives on public and illustrious thoughts. He is the world's eye. He is the world's heart. He is to resist the vulgar prosperity that retrogrades ever to barbarism, by preserving and communicating heroic sentiments, noble biographies, melodious verse, and the conclusions of history. Whatsoever oracles the human heart, in all emergencies, in all solemn hours, has uttered as its com-

mentary on the world of actions,—these he shall receive and impart. And whatsoever new verdict Reason from her inviolable seat pronounces on the passing men and events of to-day,—this he shall hear and promulgate.

These being his functions, it becomes him to feel all confidence in himself, and to defer never to the popular cry. He and he only knows the world. The world of any moment is the merest appearance. Some great decorum, some fetish of a government, some ephemeral trade, or war, or man, is cried up by half mankind and cried down by the other half, as if all depended on this particular up or down. The odds are that the whole question is not worth the poorest thought which the scholar has lost in listening to the controversy. Let him not quit his belief that a popgun is a popgun, though the ancient and honorable of the earth affirm it to be the crack of doom. In silence, in steadiness, in severe abstraction, let him hold by himself; add observation to observation, patient of neglect, patient of reproach; and bide his own time,—happy enough, if he can satisfy himself alone, that this day he has seen something truly. Success treads on every right step. For the instinct is sure that prompts him to tell his brother what he thinks. He then learns that in going down into the secrets of his own mind, he has descended into the secrets of all minds. He learns that he who has mastered any law in his private thoughts is master to that extent of all men whose language he speaks and of all into whose language his own can be translated. The poet, in utter solitude remembering his spontaneous thoughts and recording them, is found to have recorded that which men in crowded cities find true for them also. The orator distrusts at first the fitness of his frank confessions,—his want of knowledge of the persons he addresses,—until he finds that he is the com-

plement of his hearers; that they drink his words because he fulfils for them their own nature; the deeper he dives into his privatest, secretest presentiment, to his wonder he finds this is the most acceptable, most public, and universally true. The people delight in it; the better part of every man feels, This is my music; this is myself.

In self-trust all the virtues are comprehended. Free should the scholar be,—free and brave. Free even to the definition of freedom, “without any hindrance that does not arise out of his own constitution.” Brave; for fear is a thing which a scholar by his very function puts behind him. Fear always springs from ignorance. It is a shame to him if his tranquillity, amid dangerous times, arise from the presumption that, like children and women, his is a protected class; or if he seek a temporary peace by the diversion of his thoughts from politics or vexed questions, hiding his head like an ostrich in the flowering bushes, peeping into microscopes, and turning rhymes, as a boy whistles to keep his courage up. So is the danger a danger still; so is the fear worse. Manlike let him turn and face it. Let him look into its eye and search its nature, inspect its origin,—see the whelping of this lion, which lies no great way back; he will then find in himself a perfect comprehension of its nature and extent; he will have made his hands meet on the other side, and can henceforth defy it and pass on superior. The world is his who can see through its pretension. What deafness, what stone-blind custom, what overgrown error you behold is there only by sufferance,—by your sufferance. See it to be a lie, and you have already dealt it its mortal blow.

Yes, we are the cowed,—we the trustless. It is a mischievous notion that we are come late into nature; that the

world was finished a long time ago. As the world was plastic and fluid in the hands of God, so it is ever to so much of his attributes as we bring to it. To ignorance and sin, it is flint. They adapt themselves to it as they may; but in proportion as a man has anything in him divine, the firmament flows before him and takes his signet and form. Not he is great who can alter matter, but he who can alter my state of mind. They are the kings of the world who give the color of their present thought to all nature and all art, and persuade men by the cheerful serenity of their carrying the matter, that this thing which they do is the apple which the ages have desired to pluck, now at last ripe, and inviting nations to the harvest. The great man makes the great thing. Wherever Macdonald sits, there is the head of the table. Linnaeus makes botany the most alluring of studies, and wins it from the farmer and the herb-woman; Davy, chemistry; and Cuvier, fossils. The day is always his who works in it with serenity and great aims. The unstable estimates of men crowd to him whose mind is filled with a truth, as the heaped waves of the Atlantic follow the moon.

For this self-trust, the reason is deeper than can be fathomed,—darker than can be enlightened. I might not carry with me the feeling of my audience in stating my own belief. But I have already shown the ground of my hope, in advert- ing to the doctrine that man is one. I believe man has been wronged; he has wronged himself. He has almost lost the light that can lead him back to his prerogatives. Men are become of no account. Men in history, men in the world of to-day are bugs, are spawn, and are called "the mass" and "the herd." In a century, in a millennium, one or two men; that is to say,—one or two approximations to the right state of every man. All the rest behold in the hero or the poet

their own green and crude being,—ripened; yes, and are content to be less, so that may attain to its full stature. What a testimony,—full of grandeur, full of pity, is borne to the demands of his own nature, by the poor clansman, the poor partisan, who rejoices in the glory of his chief. The poor and the low find some amends to their immense moral capacity, for their acquiescence in a political and social inferiority. They are content to be brushed like flies from the path of a great person, so that justice shall be done by him to that common nature which it is the dearest desire of all to see enlarged and glorified. They sun themselves in the great man's light, and feel it to be their own element. They cast the dignity of man from their downtrod selves upon the shoulders of a hero, and will perish to add one drop of blood to make that great heart beat, those giant sinews combat and conquer. He lives for us, and we live in him.

Men such as they are, very naturally seek money or power; and power because it is as good as money,—the “spoils,” so called, “of office.” And why not? for they aspire to the highest, and this, in their sleep-walking, they dream is highest. Wake them, and they shall quit the false good and leap to the true, and leave governments to clerks and desks. This revolution is to be wrought by the gradual domestication of the idea of Culture. The main enterprise of the world for splendor, for extent, is the upbuilding of a man. Here are the materials strown along the ground. The private life of one man shall be a more illustrious monarchy,—more formidable to its enemy, more sweet and serene in its influence to its friend, than any kingdom in history. For a man, rightly viewed, comprehendeth the particular natures of all men. Each philosopher, each bard, each actor, has only done for me, as by a delegate, what one day I can do for myself. The

books which once we valued more than the apple of the eye we have quite exhausted. What is that but saying that we have come up with the point of view which the universal mind took through the eyes of one scribe; we have been that man, and have passed on. First, one; then, another; we drain all cisterns, and, waxing greater by all these supplies, we crave a better and more abundant food. The man has never lived that can feed us ever. The human mind cannot be enshrined in a person, who shall set a barrier on any one side to this unbounded, unboundable empire. It is one central fire, which, flaming now out of the lips of Etna, lightens the capes of Sicily; and, now out of the throat of Vesuvius, illuminates the towers and vineyards of Naples. It is one light which beams out of a thousand stars. It is one soul which animates all men.

But I have dwelt perhaps tediously upon this abstraction of the Scholar. I ought not to delay longer to add what I have to say, of nearer reference to the time and to this country.

Historically, there is thought to be a difference in the ideas which predominate over successive epochs, and there are data for marking the genius of the Classic, of the Romantic, and now of the Reflective or Philosophical age. With the views I have intimated of the oneness or the identity of the mind through all individuals, I do not much dwell on these differences. In fact, I believe each individual passes through all three. The boy is a Greek; the youth, romantic; the adult, reflective. I deny not, however, that a revolution in the leading idea may be distinctly enough traced.

Our age is bewailed as the age of Introversion. Must that needs be evil? We, it seems, are critical; we are embarrassed with second thoughts; we cannot enjoy anything for hanker-

ing to know whereof the pleasure consists; we are lined with eyes; we see with our feet; the time is infected with Hamlet's unhappiness—

"Sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought."

Is it so bad then? Sight is the last thing to be pitied. Would we be blind? Do we fear lest we should outsee nature and God, and drink truth dry? I look upon the discontent of the literary class as a mere announcement of the fact that they find themselves not in the state of mind of their fathers, and regret the coming state as untried, as a boy dreads the water before he has learned that he can swim. If there is any period one would desire to be born in, is it not the age of Revolution; when the old and the new stand side by side, and admit of being compared; when the energies of all men are searched by fear and by hope; when the historic glories of the old can be compensated by the rich possibilities of the new era? This time, like all times, is a very good one, if we but know what to do with it.

I read with joy some of the auspicious signs of the coming days, as they glimmer already through poetry and art, through philosophy and science, through church and state.

One of these signs is the fact that the same movement which effected the elevation of what was called the lowest class in the state assumed in literature a very marked and as benign an aspect. Instead of the sublime and beautiful, the near, the low, the common, was explored and poetized. That which had been negligently trodden under foot by those who were harnessing and provisioning themselves for long journeys into far countries is suddenly found to be richer than all foreign parts. The literature of the poor, the feelings of the child, the philosophy of the street, the meaning

of household life, are the topics of the time. It is a great stride. It is a sign, is it not? of new vigor when the extremities are made active, when currents of warm life run into the hands and the feet. I ask not for the great, the remote, the romantic, what is doing in Italy or Arabia, what is Greek art or Provençal minstrelsy; I embrace the common; I explore and sit at the feet of the familiar, the low. Give me insight into to-day, and you may have the antique and future worlds. What would we really know the meaning of? The meal in the firkin, the milk in the pan, the ballad in the street, the news of the boat, the glance of the eye, the form and the gait of the body; show me the ultimate reason of these matters; show me the sublime presence of the highest spiritual cause lurking, as always it does lurk, in these suburbs and extremities of nature; let me see every trifle bristling with the polarity that ranges it instantly on an eternal law; and the shop, the plough, and the ledger, referred to the like cause by which light undulates and poets sing—and the world lies no longer a dull miscellany and lumber-room, but has form and order; there is no trifle; there is no puzzle; but one design unites and animates the farthest pinnacle and the lowest trench.

This idea has inspired the genius of Goldsmith, Burns, Cowper, and, in a newer time, of Goethe, Wordsworth, and Carlyle. This idea they have differently followed and with various success. In contrast with their writing, the style of Pope, of Johnson, of Gibbon, looks cold and pedantic. This writing is blood-warm. Man is surprised to find that things near are not less beautiful and wondrous than things remote. The near explains the far. The drop is a small ocean. A man is related to all nature. This perception of the worth of the vulgar is fruitful in discoveries. Goethe, in this very

thing the most modern of the moderns, has shown us, as none ever did, the genius of the ancients.

There is one man of genius who has done much for this philosophy of life, whose literary value has never yet been rightly estimated; I mean Emanuel Swedenborg. The most imaginative of men, yet writing with the precision of a mathematician, he endeavored to engraft a purely philosophical Ethics on the popular Christianity of his time. Such an attempt, of course, must have difficulty which no genius could surmount. But he saw and showed the connection between nature and the affections of the soul. He pierced the emblematic or spiritual character of the visible, audible, tangible world. Especially did his shade-loving muse hover over and interpret the lower parts of nature; he showed the mysterious bond that allies moral evil to the foul material forms, and has given in epical parables a theory of insanity, of beasts, of unclean and fearful things.

Another sign of our times, also marked by an analogous political movement, is the new importance given to the single person. Everything that tends to insulate the individual—to surround him with barriers of natural respect, so that each man shall feel the world is his, and man shall treat with man as a sovereign State with a sovereign State—tends to true union as well as greatness. "I learned," said the melancholy Pestalozzi, "that no man in God's wide earth is either willing or able to help any other man." Help must come from the bosom alone. The scholar is that man who must take up into himself all the ability of the time, all the contributions of the past, all the hopes of the future. He must be an university of knowledges. If there be one lesson more than another which should pierce his ear, it is, The world is nothing, the man is all; in yourself is the law of all

nature, and you know not yet how a globule of sap ascends; in yourself slumbers the whole of Reason; it is for you to know all, it is for you to dare all. Mr. President and gentlemen, this confidence in the unsearched might of man belongs, by all motives, by all prophecy, by all preparation, to the American Scholar. We have listened too long to the courtly muses of Europe. The spirit of the American freeman is already suspected to be timid, imitative, tame. Public and private avarice make the air we breathe thick and fat. The scholar is decent, indolent, complaisant. See already the tragic consequence. The mind of this country, taught to aim at low objects, eats upon itself. There is no work for any but the decorous and the complaisant. Young men of the fairest promise, who begin life upon our shores, inflated by the mountain winds, shined upon by all the stars of God, find the earth below not in unison with these, but are hindered from action by the disgust which the principles on which business is managed inspire, and turn drudges, or die of disgust—some of them suicides. What is the remedy? They did not yet see, and thousands of young men as hopeful now crowding to the barriers for the career, do not yet see that if the single man plant himself indomitably on his instincts, and there abide, the huge world will come round to him. Patience—patience; with the shades of all the good and great for company; and for solace, the perspective of your own infinite life; and for work, the study and the communication of principles, the making those instincts prevalent, the conversion of the world. Is it not the chief disgrace in the world not to be an unit; not to be reckoned one character; not to yield that peculiar fruit which each man was created to bear, but to be reckoned in the gross, in the hundred, or the thousand, of the party, the section, to which we belong; and our

opinion predicted geographically, as the north, or the south? Not so, brothers and friends; please God ours shall not be so! We will walk on our own feet; we will work with our own hands; we will speak our own minds. The study of letters shall be no longer a name for pity, for doubt, and for sensual indulgence. The dread of man and the love of man shall be a wall of defence and a wreath of joy around all. A nation of men will for the first time exist, because each believes himself inspired by the Divine Soul, which also inspires all men.

LITERARY ETHICS

AN ORATION DELIVERED BEFORE THE LITERARY SOCIETIES OF
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, JULY, 24, 1838

GENTLEMEN—The invitation to address you this day, with which you have honored me, was a call so welcome that I made haste to obey it. A summons to celebrate with scholars a literary festival is so alluring to me as to overcome the doubts I might well entertain of my ability to bring you any thought worthy of your attention. I have reached the middle age of man; yet I believe I am not less glad or sanguine at the meeting of scholars than when a boy I first saw the graduates of my own college assembled at their anniversary. Neither years nor books have yet availed to extirpate a prejudice then rooted in me, that a scholar is the favorite of heaven and earth, the excellency of his country, the happiest of men. His duties lead him directly into the holy ground where other men's aspirations only point. His successes are occasions of the purest joy to all men. Eyes is he to the blind; feet is he to the lame. His failures, if he is worthy, are inlets to higher

advantages. And because the scholar, by every thought he thinks, extends his dominion into the general mind of men, he is not one, but many. The few scholars in each country, whose genius I know, seem to me not individuals, but societies; and, when events occur of great import, I count over these representatives of opinion, whom they will affect, as if I were counting nations. And, even if his results were incommunicable; if they abode in his own spirit; the intellect hath somewhat so sacred in its possessions, that the fact of his existence and pursuits would be a happy omen.

Meantime I know that a very different estimate of the scholar's profession prevails in this country, and the opportunity, with which society presses its claim upon young men, tends to pervert the views of the youth in respect to the culture of the intellect. Hence the historical failure, on which Europe and America have so freely commented. This country has not fulfilled what seemed the reasonable expectation of mankind. Men looked, when all feudal straps and bandages were snapped asunder, that nature, too long the mother of dwarfs, should reimburse itself by a brood of Titans, who should laugh and leap in the continent, and run up the mountains of the west with the errand of genius and of love. But the mark of American merit in painting, in sculpture, in poetry, in fiction, in eloquence, seems to be a certain grace without grandeur, and itself not new but derivative; a vase of fair outline, but empty,—which whoso sees, may fill with what wit and character is in him, but which does not, like the charged cloud, overflow with terrible beauty and emit lightnings on all beholders.

I will not lose myself in the desultory questions, what are the limitations, and what the causes of the fact. It suffices

me to say in general that the diffidence of mankind in the soul has crept over the American mind; that men here as elsewhere are indisposed to innovation and prefer any antiquity, any usage, any livery productive of ease or profit, to the unproductive service of thought.

Yet, in every sane hour, the service of thought appears reasonable, the despotism of the senses insane. The scholar may lose himself in schools, in words, and become a pedant; but when he comprehends his duties, he above all men is a realist and converses with things. For the scholar is the student of the world, and of what worth the world is, and with what emphasis it accosts the soul of man, such is the worth, such the call of the scholar.

The want of the times, and the propriety of this anniversary, concur to draw attention to the doctrine of literary ethics. What I have to say on that doctrine distributes itself under the topics of the resources, the subject, and the discipline of the scholar.

I. The resources of the scholar are proportioned to his confidence in the attributes of the intellect. The resources of the scholar are co-extensive with nature and truth, yet can never be his unless claimed by him with an equal greatness of mind. He cannot know them until he has beheld with awe the infinitude and impersonality of the intellectual power. When he has seen that it is not his nor any man's, but that it is the soul which made the world, and that it is all accessible to him, he will know that he, as its minister, may rightfully hold all things subordinate and answerable to it. A divine pilgrim in nature, all things attend his steps. Over him stream the flying constellations; over him streams time, as they scarcely divided into months and years. He inhales the year as a vapor: its fragrant midsummer breath, its spark-

ling January heaven. And so pass into his mind, in bright transfiguration, the grand events of history, to take a new order and scale from him. He is the world; and the epochs and heroes of chronology are pictorial images in which his thoughts are told. There is no event but sprung somewhere from the soul of man; and therefore there is none but the soul of man can interpret. Every presentiment of the mind is executed somewhere in a gigantic fact. What else is Greece, Rome, England, France, St. Helena? What else are churches, literatures, and empires? The new man must feel that he is new and has not come into the world mortgaged to the opinions and usages of Europe, and Asia, and Egypt. The sense of spiritual independence is like the lovely varnish of the dew, whereby the old, hard, peaked earth and its old self-same productions are made new every morning, and shining with the last touch of the artist's hand. A false humility, a complaisance to reigning schools, or to the wisdom of antiquity, must not defraud me of supreme possession of this hour. If any person have less love of liberty and less jealousy to guard his integrity, shall he therefore dictate to you and me? Say to such doctors, We are thankful to you, as we are to history, to the pyramids, and the authors; but now our day is come; we have been born out of the eternal silence; and now will we live,—live for ourselves,—and not as the pall-bearers of a funeral, but as the upholders and creators of our age; and neither Greece nor Rome, nor the three Unities of Aristotle, nor the three kings of Cologne, nor the College of the Sorbonne, nor "The Edinburgh Review," is to command any longer. Now that we are here, we will put our own interpretation on things, and our own things for interpretation. Please himself with complaisance who will,—for me, things must take my scale, not I theirs. I will say

with the warlike king, "God gave me this crown and the whole world shall not take it away."

The whole value of history, of biography, is to increase my self-trust, by demonstrating what man can be and do. This is the moral of the Plutarchs, the Cudworths, the Tennemanns, who give us the story of men or of opinions. Any history of philosophy fortifies my faith by showing me that what high dogmas I had supposed were the rare and late fruit of a cumulative culture, and only now possible to some recent Kant or Fichte,—were the prompt improvisations of the earliest inquirers; of Parmenides, Heraclitus, and Xenophanes. In view of these students, the soul seems to whisper, "There is a better way than this indolent learning of another. Leave me alone; do not teach me out of Leibnitz or Schelling and I shall find it all out myself."

Still more do we owe to biography the fortification of our hope. If you would know the power of character, see how much you would impoverish the world, if you could take clean out of history the lives of Milton, Shakespeare, and Plato,—these three, and cause them not to be. See you not, how much less the power of man would be? I console myself in the poverty of my thoughts; in the paucity of great men, in the malignity and dulness of the nations, by falling back on these sublime recollections, and seeing what the prolific soul could beget on actual nature; seeing that Plato was, and Shakespeare, and Milton,—three irrefragable facts. Then I dare; I also will essay to be. The humblest, the most hopeless, in view of these radiant facts, may now theorize and hope. In spite of all the rueful abortions that squeak and gibber in the street, in spite of slumber and guilt, in spite of the army, the bar-room, and the jail, have been these glorious manifestations of the mind; and I will thank my great

brothers so truly for the admonition of their being, as to endeavor also to be just and brave, to aspire and to speak. Plotinus too, and Spinoza, and the immortal bards of philosophy, that which they have written out with patient courage makes me bold. No more will I dismiss with haste the visions which flash and sparkle across my sky; but observe them, approach them, domesticate them, brood on them, and draw out of the past genuine life for the present hour.

To feel the full value of these lives, as occasions of hope and provocation, you must come to know that each admirable genius is but a successful diver in that sea whose floor of pearls is all your own. The impoverishing philosophy of ages has laid stress on the distinctions of the individual and not on the universal attributes of man. The youth, intoxicated with his admiration of a hero, fails to see that it is only a projection of his own soul which he admires. In solitude, in a remote village, the ardent youth loiters and mourns. With inflamed eye in this sleeping wilderness he has read the story of the Emperor Charles V until his fancy has brought home to the surrounding woods the faint roar of cannonades in the Milanese and marches in Germany. He is curious concerning that man's day. What filled it? the crowded orders, the stern decisions, the foreign despatches, the Castilian etiquette? The soul answers—Behold his day here! In the sighing of these woods, in the quiet of these gray fields, in the cool breeze that sings out of these northern mountains; in the workmen, the boys, the maidens, you meet,—in the hopes of the morning, the ennui of noon, and sauntering of the afternoon; in the disquieting comparisons; in the regrets at want of vigor; in the great idea, and the puny execution;—behold Charles V's day; another, yet the same; behold Chatham's, Hampden's, Bayard's,

Alfred's, Scipio's, Pericles's day,—day of all that are born of women. The difference of circumstance is merely costume. I am tasting the self-same life,—its sweetness, its greatness, its pain, which I so admire in other men. Do not foolishly ask of the inscrutable, obliterated past, what it cannot tell,—the details of that nature, of that day, called Byron, or Burke—but ask it of the enveloping now; the more quaintly you inspect its evanescent beauties, its wonderful details, its spiritual causes, its astounding whole,—so much the more you master the biography of this hero and that and every hero. Be lord of a day, through wisdom and justice, and you can put up your history books.

An intimation of these broad rights is familiar in the sense of injury which men feel in the assumption of any man to limit their possible progress. We resent all criticism which denies us anything that lies in our line of advance. Say to the man of letters, that he cannot paint a transfiguration, or build a steamboat, or be a grand-marshal,—and he will not seem to himself depreciated. But deny to him any quality of literary or metaphysical power and he is piqued. Concede to him genius, which is a sort of stoical *plenum* annulling the comparative, and he is content; but concede him talents never so rare, denying him genius, and he is aggrieved. What does this mean? Why, simply that the soul has assurance, by instincts and presentiments, of all power in the direction of its ray, as well as of the special skills it has already acquired.

In order to a knowledge of the resources of the scholar, we must not rest in the use of slender accomplishments,—of facilities to do this and that other feat with words; but we must pay our vows to the highest power and pass, if it be possible, by assiduous love and watching, into the visions

of absolute truth. The growth of the intellect is strictly analogous in all individuals. It is larger reception. Able men in general have good dispositions and a respect for justice; because an able man is nothing else than a good, free, vascular organization, whereinto the universal spirit freely flows; so that his fund of justice is not only vast, but infinite. All men, in the abstract, are just and good; what hinders them in the particular is the momentary predominance of the finite and individual over the general truth. The condition of our incarnation in a private self seems to be a perpetual tendency to prefer the private law, to obey the private impulse, to the exclusion of the law of universal being. The hero is great by means of the predominance of the universal nature; he has only to open his mouth and it speaks; he has only to be forced to act and it acts. All men catch the word or embrace the deed with the heart, for it is verily theirs as much as his; but in them this disease of an excess of organization cheats them of equal issues. Nothing is more simple than greatness; indeed, to be simple is to be great. The vision of genius comes by renouncing the too officious activity of the understanding and giving leave and amplest privilege to the spontaneous sentiment. Out of this must all that is alive and genial in thought go. Men grind and grind in the mill of a truism and nothing comes out but what was put in. But the moment they desert the tradition for a spontaneous thought, then poetry, wit, hope, virtue, learning, anecdote, all flock to their aid. Observe the phenomenon of extempore debate. A man of cultivated mind, but reserved habits, sitting silent, admires the miracle of free, impassioned, picturesque speech in the man addressing an assembly—a state of being and power, how unlike his own! Presently his own emotion rises to his lips, and over-

flows in speech. He must also rise and say somewhat. Once embarked, once having overcome the novelty of the situation, he finds it just as easy and natural to speak,—to speak with thoughts, with pictures, with rhythmical balance of sentences,—as it was to sit silent; for, it needs not to do, but to suffer; he only adjusts himself to the free spirit which gladly utters itself through him, and motion is as easy as rest.

II. I pass now to consider the task offered to the intellect of this country. The view I have taken of the resources of the scholar presupposes a subject as broad. We do not seem to have imagined its riches. We have not heeded the invitation it holds out. To be as good a scholar as Englishmen are; to have as much learning as our contemporaries; to have written a book that is read; satisfies us. We assume that all thought is already long ago adequately set down in books,—all imaginations in poems; and what we say, we only throw in as confirmatory of this supposed complete body of literature. A very shallow assumption. Say rather, all literature is yet to be written. Poetry has scarce chanted its first song. The perpetual admonition of nature to us, is, "The world is new, untried. Do not believe the past. I give you the universe a virgin to-day."

By Latin and English poetry, we were born and bred in an oratorio of praises of nature,—flowers, birds, mountains, sun, and moon; yet the naturalist of this hour finds that he knows nothing, by all their poems, of any of these fine things; that he has conversed with the mere surface and show of them all; and of their essence or of their history knows nothing. Further inquiry will discover that nobody,—that not these chanting poets themselves, knew anything sincere of these handsome natures they so commended; that they contented themselves with the passing chirp of a bird, that

they saw one or two mornings, and listlessly looked at sunsets, and repeated idly these few glimpses in their song. But go into the forest, you shall find all new and undescribed. The screaming of the wild geese flying by night; the thin note of the companionable titmouse in the winter day; the fall of swarms of flies in autumn, from combats high in the air, pattering down on the leaves like rain; the angry hiss of the woodbirds; the pine throwing out its pollen for the benefit of the next century; the turpentine exuding from the tree; and indeed any vegetation; any animation; any and all, are alike unattempted. The man who stands on the seashore, or who rambles in the woods, seems to be the first man that ever stood on the shore, or entered a grove, his sensations and his world are so novel and strange. Whilst I read the poets I think that nothing new can be said about morning and evening. But when I see the daybreak I am not reminded of these Homeric, or Skakespearian, or Miltonic, or Chaucerian pictures. No; but I feel perhaps the pain of an alien world; a world not yet subdued by the thought; or, I am cheered by the moist, warm, glittering, budding, melodious hour, that takes down the narrow walls of my soul and extends its life and pulsation to the very horizon. That is morning, to cease for a bright hour to be a prisoner of this sickly body, and to become as large as nature.

The noonday darkness of the American forest, the deep, echoing, aboriginal woods, where the living columns of the oak and fir tower up from the ruins of the trees of the last millennium; where from year to year the eagle and the crow see no intruder; the pines, bearded with savage moss, yet touched with grace by the violets at their feet; the broad, cold lowland, which forms its coat of vapor with the stillness of subterranean crystallization; and where the traveller,

amid the repulsive plants that are native in the swamp, thinks with pleasing terror of the distant town; this beauty,—haggard and desert beauty, which the sun and the moon, the snow and the rain, repaint and vary, has never been recorded by art, yet is not indifferent to any passenger. All men are poets at heart. They serve nature for bread, but her loveliness overcomes them sometimes. What mean these journeys to Niagara; these pilgrims to the White Hills? Men believe in the adaptations of utility, always: in the mountains they may believe in the adaptations of the eye. Undoubtedly the changes of geology have a relation to the prosperous sprouting of the corn and peas in my kitchen garden; but not less is there a relation of beauty between my soul and the dim crags of Agiocochook up there in the clouds. Every man, when this is told, hearkens with joy, and yet his own conversation with nature is still unsung.

Is it otherwise with civil history? Is it not the lesson of our experience that every man, were life long enough, would write history for himself? What else do these volumes of extracts and manuscript commentaries that every scholar writes indicate? Greek history is one thing to me; another to you. Since the birth of Niebuhr and Wolf, Roman and Greek history have been written anew. Since Carlyle wrote French history we see that no history that we have is safe, but a new classifier shall give it new and more philosophical arrangement. Thucydides, Livy, have only provided materials. The moment a man of genius pronounces the name of the Pelasgi, of Athens, of the Etrurian, of the Roman people, we see their state under a new aspect. As in poetry and history, so in the other departments. There are few masters or none. Religion is yet to be settled on its fast foundations in the breast of man; and politics, and philoso-

phy, and letters, and art. As yet we have nothing but tendency and indication.

This starting, this warping of the best literary works from the adamant of nature, is especially observable in philosophy. Let it take what tone of pretension it will, to this complexion must it come at last. Take for example the French eclecticism, which Cousin esteems so conclusive; there is an optical illusion in it. It avows great pretensions. It looks as if they had all truth in taking all the systems, and had nothing to do but to sift and wash and strain, and the gold and diamonds would remain in the last colander. But truth is such a flyaway, such a slyboots, so untransportable and unbarrelable a commodity, that it is as bad to catch as light. Shut the shutters never so quick, to keep all the light in, it is all in vain; it is gone before you can cry, hold. And so it happens with our philosophy. Translate, collate, distil all the systems, it steads you nothing; for truth will not be compelled in any mechanical manner. But the first observation you make in the sincere act of your nature, though on the veriest trifle, may open a new view of nature and of man, that, like a menstruum, shall dissolve all theories in it; shall take up Greece, Rome, stoicism, eclecticism, and what not, as mere data and food for analysis, and dispose of your world-containing system as a very little unit. A profound thought, anywhere, classifies all things: a profound thought will lift Olympus. The book of philosophy is only a fact, and no more inspiring fact than another, and no less; but a wise man will never esteem it anything final and transcending. Go and talk with a man of genius, and the first word he utters sets all your so-called knowledge afloat and at large. Then Plato, Bacon, Kant, and the eclectic Cousin, condescend instantly to be men and mere facts.

I by no means aim, in these remarks, to disparage the merit of these or of any existing compositions; I only say that any particular portraiture does not in any manner exclude or forestall a new attempt, but when considered by the soul, warps and shrinks away. The inundation of the spirit sweeps away before it all our little architecture of wit and memory as straws and straw-huts before the torrent. Works of the intellect are great only by comparison with each other. *Ivanhoe* and *Waverley* compared with *Castle Radcliffe* and the *Porter* novels; but nothing is great,—not mighty *Homer* and *Milton*,—beside the infinite reason. It carries them away as a flood. They are as a sleep.

Thus is justice done to each generation and individual,—wisdom teaching man that he shall not hate, or fear, or mimic his ancestors; that he shall not bewail himself as if the world was old and thought was spent and he was born into the dotage of things; for, by virtue of the Deity, thought renews itself inexhaustibly every day, and the thing whereon it shines, though it were dust and sand, is a new subject with countless relations.

III. Having thus spoken of the resources and the subject of the scholar, out of the same faith proceeds also the rule of his ambition and life. Let him know that the world is his, but he must possess it by putting himself into harmony with the constitution of things. He must be a solitary, laborious, modest, and charitable soul.

He must embrace solitude as a bride. He must have his glees and his glooms alone. His own estimate must be measure enough, his own praise reward enough for him. And why must the student be solitary and silent? That he may become acquainted with his thoughts. If he pines in a lonely place hankering for the crowd, for display, he is not

in the lonely place; his heart is in the market; he does not see; he does not hear; he does not think. But go cherish your soul; expel companions; set your habits to a life of solitude; then will the faculties rise fair and full within, like forest trees and field flowers; you will have results, which, when you meet your fellow men, you can communicate and they will gladly receive. Do not go into solitude only that you may presently come into public. Such solitude denies itself; is public and stale. The public can get public experience, but they wish the scholar to replace to them those private, sincere, divine experiences of which they have been defrauded by dwelling in the street. It is the noble, manlike, just thought which is the superiority demanded of you, and not crowds, but solitude confers this elevation. Not insulation of place, but independence of spirit is essential, and it is only as the garden, the cottage, the forest, and the rock, are a sort of mechanical aids to this, that they are of value. Think alone, and all places are friendly and sacred. The poets who have lived in cities have been hermits still. Inspiration makes solitude anywhere. Pindar, Raphael, Angelo, Dryden, De Staël, dwell in crowds it may be, but the instant thought comes the crowd grows dim to their eye; their eye fixes on the horizon,—on vacant space; they forget the bystanders; they spurn personal relations; they deal with abstractions, with verities, with ideas. They are alone with the mind.

Of course I would not have any superstition about solitude. Let the youth study the uses of solitude and of society. Let him use both, not serve either. The reason why an ingenious soul shuns society is to the end of finding society. It repudiates the false out of love of the true. You can very soon learn all that society can teach you for one while. Its foolish

routine, an indefinite multiplication of balls, concerts, rides, theatres, can teach you no more than a few can. Then accept the hint of shame, of spiritual emptiness and waste, which true nature gives you and retire and hide; lock the door; shut the shutters; then welcome falls the imprisoning rain,—dear hermitage of nature. Re-collect the spirits. Have solitary prayer and praise. Digest and correct the past experience; and blend it with the new and divine life.

You will pardon me, gentlemen, if I say I think that we have need of a more rigorous scholastic rule; such an asceticism, I mean, as only the hardihood and devotion of the scholar himself can enforce. We live in the sun and on the surface,—a thin, plausible, superficial existence, and talk of muse and prophet, of art and creation. But out of our shallow and frivolous way of life, how can greatness ever grow? Come now, let us go and be dumb. Let us sit with our hands on our mouths, a long, austere, Pythagorean lustrum. Let us live in corners and do chores, and suffer, and weep, and drudge, with eyes and hearts that love the Lord. Silence, seclusion, austerity, may pierce deep into the grandeur and secret of our being, and so diving bring up out of secular darkness the sublimities of the moral constitution. How mean to go blazing, a gaudy butterfly, in fashionable or political saloons, the fool of society, the fool of notoriety, a topic for newspapers, a piece of the street, and forfeiting the real prerogative of the russet coat, the privacy, and the true and warm heart of the citizen!

Fatal to the man of letters, fatal to man, is the lust of display, the seeming that unmakes our being. A mistake of the main end to which they labor is incident to literary men, who, dealing with the organ of languages,—the subtlest,

strongest, and longest-lived of man's creations, and only fitly used as the weapon of thought and of justice,—learn to enjoy the pride of playing with this splendid engine, but rob it of its almightiness by failing to work with it. Extricating themselves from the tasks of the world, the world revenges itself by exposing at every turn the folly of these incomplete, pedantic, useless, ghostly creatures. The scholar will feel that the richest romance,—the noblest fiction that was ever woven,—the heart and soul of beauty,—lies enclosed in human life. Itself of surpassing value, it is also the richest material for his creations. How shall he know its secrets of tenderness, of terror, of will, and of fate? How can he catch and keep the strain of upper music that peals from it? Its laws are concealed under the details of daily action. All action is an experiment upon them. He must bear his share of the common load. He must work with men in houses, and not with their names in books. His needs, appetites, talents, affections, accomplishments, are keys that open to him the beautiful museum of human life. Why should he read it as an Arabian tale, and not know, in his own beating bosom, its sweet and smart? Out of love and hatred, out of earnings, and borrowings, and lendings, and losses; out of sickness and pain; out of wooing and worshipping; out of travelling, and voting, and watching, and caring; out of disgrace and contempt, comes our tuition in the serene and beautiful laws. Let him not slur his lesson; let him learn it by heart. Let him endeavor exactly, bravely, and cheerfully, to solve the problem of that life which is set before him. And this, by punctual action and not by promises or dreams. Believing, as in God, in the presence and favor of the grandest influences, let him deserve that favor and learn how to receive and use it by fidelity also to the lower observances.

This lesson is taught with emphasis in the life of the great actor of this age and affords the explanation of his success. Bonaparte represents truly a great recent revolution, which we in this country, please God, shall carry to its farthest consummation. Not the least instructive passage in modern history, seems to me a trait of Napoleon, exhibited to the English when he became their prisoner. On coming on board the "Bellerophon," a file of English soldiers drawn up on deck, gave him a military salute. Napoleon observed, that their manner of handling their arms differed from the French exercise, and, putting aside the guns of those nearest him, walked up to a soldier, took his gun, and himself went through the motion in the French mode. The English officers and men looked on with astonishment, and inquired if such familiarity was usual with the emperor.

In this instance, as always, that man, with whatever defects or vices, represented performance in lieu of pretension. Feudalism and Orientalism had long enough thought it majestic to do nothing; the modern majesty consists in work. He belonged to a class, fast growing in the world, who think that what a man can do is his greatest ornament, and that he always consults his dignity by doing it. He was not a believer in luck; he had a faith, like sight, in the application of means to ends. Means to ends is the motto of all his behavior. He believed that the great captains of antiquity performed their exploits only by correct combinations and by justly comparing the relation between means and consequences; efforts and obstacles. The vulgar call good fortune that which really is produced by the calculations of genius. But Napoleon, thus faithful to facts, had also this crowning merit; that whilst he believed in number and weight and omitted no part of prudence, he believed also in the freedom

and quite incalculable force of the soul. A man of infinite caution, he neglected never the least particular of preparation of patient adaptation; yet nevertheless he had a sublime confidence, as in his all, in the sallies of the courage, and the faith in his destiny, which at the right moment repaired all losses and demolished cavalry, infantry, king, and kaiser as with irresistible thunderbolts. As they say the bough of the tree has the character of the leaf, and the whole tree of the bough, so, it is curious to remark, Bonaparte's army partook of this double strength of the captain; for, whilst strictly supplied in all its appointments and everything expected from the valor and discipline of every platoon in flank and centre, yet always remained his total trust in the prodigious revolutions of fortune, which his reserved Imperial Guard were capable of working, if, in all else, the day was lost. Here he was sublime. He no longer calculated the chance of the cannon ball. He was faithful to tactics to the uttermost,—and when all tactics had come to an end then he dilated and availed himself of the mighty saltations of the most formidable soldiers in nature.

Let the scholar appreciate this combination of gifts which applied to better purpose make true wisdom. He is a revealer of things. Let him first learn the things. Let him not, too eager to grasp some badge of reward, omit the work to be done. Let him know that though the success of the market is in the reward, true success is the doing; that, in the private obedience to his mind; in the sedulous inquiry, day after day, year after year, to know how the thing stands; in the use of all means and most in the reverence of the humble commerce and humble needs of life,—to hearken what they say, and so, by mutual reaction of thought and life to make thought solid, and life wise; and in a contempt for the gabble

of to-day's opinions the secret of the world is to be learned, and the skill truly to unfold it is acquired. Or rather it is not that by this discipline the usurpation of the senses is overcome and the lower faculties of man are subdued to docility; through which, as an unobstructed channel, the soul now easily and gladly flows?

The good scholar will not refuse to bear the yoke in his youth; to know, if he can, the uttermost secret of toil and endurance; to make his own hands acquainted with the soil by which he is fed and the sweat that goes before comfort and luxury. Let him pay his tithe and serve the world as a true and noble man; never forgetting to worship the immortal divinities, who whisper to the poet and make him the utterer of melodies that pierce the ear of eternal time. If he have this twofold goodness—the drill and the inspiration—then he has health; then he is a whole and not a fragment; and the perfection of his endowment will appear in his compositions. Indeed, this twofold merit characterizes ever the productions of great masters. The man of genius should occupy the whole space between God, or pure mind, and the multitude of uneducated men. He must draw from the infinite reason on one side and he must penetrate into the heart and sense of the crowd on the other. From one he must draw his strength; to the other he must owe his aim. The one yokes him to the real, the other to the apparent. At one pole is reason, at the other common sense. If he be defective at either extreme of the scale his philosophy will seem low and utilitarian; or it will appear too vague and indefinite for the uses of life.

The student, as we all along insist, is great only by being passive to the superincumbent spirit. Let this faith, then, dictate all his action. Snares and bribes abound to mislead

him; let him be true nevertheless. His success has its perils too. There is somewhat inconvenient and injurious in his position. They whom his thoughts have entertained or inflamed seek him before yet they have learned the hard conditions of thought. They seek him that he may turn his lamp on the dark riddles whose solution they think is inscribed on the walls of their being. They find that he is a poor, ignorant man, in a white-seamed, rusty coat, like themselves, no wise emitting a continuous stream of light, but now and then a jet of luminous thought, followed by total darkness; moreover, that he cannot make of his infrequent illumination a portable taper to carry whither he would and explain now this dark riddle, now that. Sorrow ensues. The scholar regrets to damp the hope of ingenuous boys; and the youth has lost a star out of his new flaming firmament. Hence the temptation to the scholar to mystify; to hear the question; to sit upon it; to make an answer of words in lack of the oracle of things. Not the less let him be cold and true, and wait in patience, knowing that truth can make even silence eloquent and memorable. Truth shall be policy enough for him. Let him open his breast to all honest inquiry and be an artist superior to tricks of art. Show frankly, as a saint would do, your experience, methods, tools, and means. Welcome all comers to the freest use of the same. And out of this superior frankness and charity you shall learn higher secrets of your nature, which gods will bend and aid you to communicate.


If, with a high trust, he can thus submit himself, he will find that ample returns are poured into his bosom out of what seemed hours of obstruction and loss. Let him not grieve too much on account of unfit associates. When he sees how much thought he owes to the disagreeable antagonism of vari-

ous persons who pass and cross him he can easily think that in a society of perfect sympathy no word, no act, no record, would be. He will learn that it is not much matter what he reads, what he does. Be a scholar, and he shall have the scholar's part of everything. As in the counting-room the merchant cares little whether the cargo be hides or barilla; the transaction a letter of credit or a transfer of stocks; be it what it may, his commission comes gently out of it; so you shall get your lesson out of the hour and the object, whether it be a concentrated or a wasteful employment, even in reading a dull book or working off a stint of mechanical day labor, which your necessities or the necessities of others impose.

Gentlemen, I have ventured to offer you these considerations upon the scholar's place, and hope, because I thought that, standing as many of you now do, on the threshold of this college, girt and ready to go and assume tasks, public and private, in your country, you would not be sorry to be admonished of those primary duties of the intellect whereof you will seldom hear from the lips of your new companions. You will hear every day the maxims of a low prudence. You will hear that the first duty is to get land and money, place and name. "What is this truth you seek? what is this beauty?" men will ask with derision. If, nevertheless, God have called any of you to explore truth and beauty, be bold, be firm, be true. When you shall say, "As others do, so will I; I renounce, I am sorry for it, my early visions; I must eat the good of the land and let learning and romantic expectations go until a more convenient season;" then dies the man in you; then once more perish the buds of art, and poetry, and science, as they have died already in a thousand thousand men. The hour of that choice is the crisis of your history; and see that you hold yourself fast by the intellect. It is

this domineering temper of the sensual world that creates the extreme need of the priests of science; and it is the office and right of the intellect to make and not take its estimate. Bend to the persuasion which is flowing to you from every object in nature, to be its tongue to the heart of man, and to show the besotted world how passing fair is wisdom. Forewarned that the vice of the times and the country is an excessive pretension, let us seek the shade and find wisdom in neglect. Be content with a little light, so it be your own. Explore and explore. Be neither chided nor flattered out of your position of perpetual inquiry. Neither dogmatize nor accept another's dogmatism. Why should you renounce your right to traverse the star-lit deserts of truth for the premature comforts of an acre, house, and barn? Truth also has its roof, and bed, and board. Make yourself necessary to the world and mankind will give you bread, and if not store of it, yet such as shall not take away your property in all men's possessions, in all men's affections, in art, in nature, and in hope.

You will not fear that I am enjoining too stern an asceticism. Ask not, Of what use is a scholarship that systematically retreats? or, Who is the better for the philosopher who conceals his accomplishments and hides his thoughts from the waiting world? Hides his thoughts! Hide the sun and moon. Thought is all light and publishes itself to the universe. It will speak, though you were dumb, by its own miraculous organ. It will flow out of your actions, your manners, and your face. It will bring you friendships. It will impledge you to truth by the love and expectation of generous minds. By virtue of the laws of that nature which is one and perfect it shall yield every sincere good that is in the soul to the scholar beloved of earth and heaven.



D'ISRAELI (EARL OF BEACONSFIELD)

LORD BEACONSFIELD



BENJAMIN DISRAELI, EARL OF BEACONSFIELD, British statesman, novelist, and man of letters, and a unique and picturesque figure in English politics, was born at Islington, London, Dec. 21, 1804, and died at London, April 19, 1881. He was the son of Isaac D'Israeli, author of the "Curiosities of Literature," and the "Amenities of Literature," whose father, of Hebrew stock, had fled from the Spanish Inquisition and settled in England in 1747. The latter's brilliant grandson, after receiving a good education, entered an attorney's office to study law; but tiring of the drudgery, he made his début as a somewhat dazzling novelist, and after a period of travel made several attempts to get into Parliament, the object of his great ambition. His purpose in this, however, suffered repeated defeats, as well as discomfiture when he did gain entrance into the Commons, for his manner and style of speaking so excited the "risibles" of the House that he had to take his seat amid laughter and derision. As he did so, he exclaimed: "I shall sit down now, but the time will come when you will hear me!" Ere long his prophecy came true, for what with his fame as a novelist—his "Vivian Grey" and other stories, with their portraiture of notable personages under thin disguises, won him success in full measure—and his gifts as an eloquent speaker and parliamentary tactician, the House *did* hear him and admire his cleverness and audacity and dubbed him chief of the "Young England party." His powers of invective and sarcasm were great, while his loyalty to political principle was at first not conspicuous. Both of these characteristics were ere long manifested in his vituperative attacks upon Sir Robert Peel, who, Disraeli affirmed, had been elected as a champion of protection and had betrayed his party—or, as he wittily said of Sir Robert's adoption of Liberal measures, "The right honorable gentleman caught the Whigs bathing and walked away with their clothes." Disraeli's own inconsistency at this period is obvious when it is recalled that he sought at first to enter Parliament as a Liberal, and even a Radical, under the banner of Hume and O'Connell, the latter of whom, it will be remembered, once spoke tauntingly of Disraeli as "a lineal descendant of the impenitent thief upon the cross." There is no doubt, however, of what he became when he took office in the Conservative Lord Derby's cabinet, in 1852, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, passing in time to a full-fledged Imperialist, as Prime Minister in 1868, and again in 1874, on to his elevation, in the year of the Berlin Treaty (1878), to the House of Lords and the Peerage. One of the most noted acts of his at this time was the creation of the title of Empress of India conferred upon the late Queen Victoria. The character of Disraeli has been extensively discussed, but even those who regard him unfavorably usually concede that he was a great statesman, if not always a wise one. His speeches exhibit clear, concise argument, almost unequaled satire, and could always hold an audience. His appearance at any period of his life was striking, and both in youth and age lent itself readily to the purposes of caricature. As a novelist he was very unequal, but had he devoted himself wholly to fiction he might have been among the greatest.

"CONSERVATISM"

MANCHESTER, APRIL 3, 1872.

I HAVE not come down to Manchester to deliver an essay on the English Constitution; but when the banner of Republicanism is unfurled—when the fundamental principles of our institutions are controverted—I think, perhaps, it may not be inconvenient that I should make some few practical remarks upon the character of our Constitution—upon that monarchy limited by the co-ordinate authority of the estates of the realm, which, under the title of Queen, Lords, and Commons, has contributed so greatly to the prosperity of this country.

Gentlemen, since the settlement of that Constitution, now nearly two centuries ago, England has never experienced a revolution, though there is no country in which there has been so continuous and such considerable change. How is this? Because the wisdom of your forefathers placed the prize of supreme power without the sphere of human passions. Whatever the struggle of parties, whatever the strife of factions, whatever the excitement and exaltation of the public mind, there has always been something in this country round which all classes and parties could rally, representing the majesty of the law, the administration of justice, and involving, at the same time, the security for every man's rights and the fountain of honor. Now, gentlemen, it is well clearly to comprehend what is meant by a country not having a revolution for two centuries. It means, for that space, the unbroken exercise and enjoyment of the ingenuity of man. It means for that space the

continuous application of the discoveries of science to his comfort and convenience. It means the accumulation of capital, the elevation of labor, the establishment of those admirable factories which cover your district; the unwearied improvement of the cultivation of the land, which has extracted from a somewhat churlish soil harvests more exuberant than those furnished by lands nearer to the sun. It means the continuous order which is the only parent of personal liberty and political right. And you owe all these, gentlemen, to the throne.

There is another powerful and most beneficial influence which is also exercised by the crown. Gentlemen, I am a party man. I believe that, without party, parliamentary government is impossible. I look upon parliamentary government as the noblest government in the world, and certainly the one most suited to England. But without the discipline of political connection, animated by the principle of private honor, I feel certain that a popular assembly would sink before the power or the corruption of a minister. Yet, gentlemen, I am not blind to the faults of party government. It has one great defect. Party has a tendency to warp the intelligence, and there is no minister, however resolved he may be in treating a great public question, who does not find some difficulty in emancipating himself from the traditionary prejudice on which he has long acted. It is, therefore, a great merit in our Constitution, that before a minister introduces a measure to Parliament, he must submit it to an intelligence superior to all party, and entirely free from influences of that character.

I know it will be said, gentlemen, that, however beautiful in theory, the personal influence of the sovereign is now absorbed in the responsibility of the minister. Gentle-

men, I think you will find there is great fallacy in this view. The principles of the English Constitution do not contemplate the absence of personal influence on the part of the sovereign; and if they did, the principles of human nature would prevent the fulfilment of such a theory. Gentlemen, I need not tell you that I am now making on this subject abstract observations of general application to our institutions and our history. But take the case of a sovereign of England who accedes to his throne at the earliest age the law permits, and who enjoys a long reign—take an instance like that of George III. From the earliest moment of his accession that sovereign is placed in constant communication with the most able statesmen of the period, and of all parties. Even with average ability it is impossible not to perceive that such a sovereign must soon attain a great mass of political information and political experience. Information and experience, gentlemen, whether they are possessed by a sovereign or by the humblest of his subjects, are irresistible in life. No man with the vast responsibility that devolves upon an English minister can afford to treat with indifference a suggestion that has not occurred to him, or information with which he had not been previously supplied. But, gentlemen, pursue this view of the subject. The longer the reign, the influence of that sovereign must proportionately increase. All the illustrious statesmen who served his youth disappear. A new generation of public servants rises up, there is a critical conjunction in affairs—a moment of perplexity and peril. Then it is that the sovereign can appeal to a similar state of affairs that occurred perhaps thirty years before. When all are in doubt among his servants, he can quote the advice that was given by the illustrious men of his early

years, and, though he may maintain himself within the strictest limits of the Constitution, who can suppose, when such information and such suggestions are made by the most exalted person in the country, that they can be without effect? No, gentlemen; a minister who could venture to treat such influence with indifference would not be a constitutional minister, but an arrogant idiot.

Gentlemen, the influence of the crown is not confined merely to political affairs. England is a domestic country. Here the home is revered and the hearth is sacred. The nation is represented by a family—the royal family; and if that family is educated with a sense of responsibility and a sentiment of public duty, it is difficult to exaggerate the salutary influence they may exercise over a nation. It is not merely an influence upon manners; it is not merely that they are a model for refinement and for good taste—they affect the heart as well as the intelligence of the people; and in the hour of public adversity, or in the anxious conjuncture of public affairs, the nation rallies round the family and the throne, and its spirit is animated and sustained by the expression of public affection. Gentlemen, there is yet one other remark that I would make upon our monarchy, though had it not been for recent circumstances, I should have refrained from doing so. An attack has recently been made upon the throne on account of the costliness of the institution. Gentlemen, I shall not dwell upon the fact that if the people of England appreciate the monarchy, as I believe they do, it would be painful to them that their royal and representative family should not be maintained with becoming dignity, or fill in the public eye a position inferior to some of the noblest of the land. Nor will I insist upon what is unquestionably the fact, that the revenues of

the crown estates, on which our sovereign might live with as much right as the Duke of Bedford, or the Duke of Northumberland, has to his estates, are now paid into the public exchequer. All this, upon the present occasion, I am not going to insist upon. What I now say is this: that there is no sovereignty of any first-rate state which costs so little to the people as the sovereignty of England. I will not compare our civil list with those of European empires, because it is known that in amount they treble and quadruple it; but I will compare it with the cost of sovereignty in a republic, and that a republic with which you are intimately acquainted—the republic of the United States of America.

Gentlemen, there is no analogy between the position of our sovereign, Queen Victoria, and that of the President of the United States. The President of the United States is not the sovereign of the United States. There is a very near analogy between the position of the President of the United States and that of the Prime Minister of England, and both are paid at much the same rate—the income of a second-class professional man. The sovereign of the United States is the people; and I will now show you what the sovereignty of the United States costs. Gentlemen, you are aware of the constitution of the United States. There are thirty-seven independent States, each with a sovereign Legislature. Besides these, there is a confederation of States, to conduct their external affairs, which consists of the House of Representatives and a Senate. There are two hundred and eighty-five members of the House of Representatives, and there are seventy-four members of the Senate, making altogether three hundred and fifty-nine members of Congress. Now each

•

member of Congress receives £1,000 sterling per annum. In addition to this he receives an allowance called "mileage," which varies according to the distance which he travels, but the aggregate cost of which is about £30,000 per annum. That makes £389,000, almost the exact amount of our civil list.

But this, gentlemen, will allow you to make only a very imperfect estimate of the cost of sovereignty in the United States. Every member of every Legislature in the thirty-seven States is also paid. There are, I believe, five thousand and ten members of State Legislatures, who receive about \$350 per annum each. As some of the returns are imperfect, the average which I have given of expenditure may be rather high, and therefore I have not counted the mileage, which is also universally allowed. Five thousand and ten members of State Legislatures at \$350 each make \$1,753,500, of £350,700 sterling a year. So you see, gentlemen, that the immediate expenditure for the sovereignty of the United States is between £700,000 and £800,000 a year. Gentlemen, I have not time to pursue this interesting theme, otherwise I could show that you have still but imperfectly ascertained the cost of sovereignty in a republic. But, gentlemen, I cannot resist giving out one further illustration.

The government of this country is considerably carried on by the aid of royal commissions. So great is the increase of public business that it would be probably impossible for a minister to carry on affairs without this assistance. The Queen of England can command for these objects the services of the most experienced statesmen, and men of the highest position in society. If necessary, she can summon to them distinguished scholars or men most celebrated in

science and in arts; and she receives from them services that are unpaid. They are only too proud to be described in the commission as her Majesty's "trustworthy councillors"; and if any member of these commissions performs some transcendent services, both of thought and of labor, he is munificently rewarded by a public distinction conferred upon him by the fountain of honor. Gentlemen, the government of the United States has, I believe, not less availed itself of the services of commissions than the government of the United Kingdom; but in a country where there is no fountain of honor, every member of these commissions is paid.

Gentlemen, I trust I have now made some suggestions to you respecting the monarchy of England which at least may be so far serviceable that when we are separated they may not be altogether without advantage; and now, gentlemen, I would say something on the subject of the House of Lords. It is not merely the authority of the throne that is now disputed; but the character and the influence of the House of Lords that are held up by some to public disregard. Gentlemen, I shall not stop for a moment to offer you any proofs of the advantage of a second chamber; and for this reason. That subject has been discussed now for a century, ever since the establishment of the government of the United States; and all great authorities, American, German, French, Italian, have agreed in this, that a representative government is impossible without a second chamber. And it has been, especially of late, maintained by great political writers in all countries, that the repeated failure of what is called the French republic is mainly to be ascribed to its not having a second chamber.

But, gentlemen, however anxious foreign countries have

been to enjoy this advantage, that anxiety has only been equalled by the difficulty which they have found in fulfilling their object. How is a second chamber to be constituted? By nominees of the sovereign power? What influence can be exercised by a chamber of nominees? Are they to be bound by popular election? In what manner are they to be elected? If by the same constituency as the popular body, what claim have they, under such circumstances, to criticise or to control the decisions of that body? If they are to be elected by a more select body, qualified by a higher franchise, there immediately occurs the objection, why should the majority be governed by the minority? The United States of America were fortunate in finding a solution of this difficulty; but the United States of America had elements to deal with which never occurred before, and never probably will occur again, because they formed their illustrious Senate from materials that were offered them by the thirty-seven States. We, gentlemen, have the House of Lords, an assembly which has historically developed and periodically adapted itself to the wants and necessities of the times.

What, gentlemen, is the first quality which is required in a second chamber? Without doubt, independence. What is the best foundation of independence? Without doubt, property. The Prime Minister of England has only recently told you, and I believe he spoke quite accurately, that the average income of the members of the House of Lords is £20,000 per annum. Of course there are some who have more, and some who have less; but the influence of a public assembly, so far as property is concerned, depends upon its aggregate property, which, in the present case, is a revenue of £9,000,000 a year. But, gentlemen,

you must look to the nature of this property. It is visible property, and therefore it is responsible property, which every ratepayer in the room knows to his cost. But, gentlemen, it is not only visible property; it is, generally speaking, territorial property; and one of the elements of territorial property is, that it is representative. Now, for illustration, suppose—which God forbid—there was no House of Commons, and any Englishman—I will take him from either end of the island—a Cumberland, or a Cornish man, finds himself aggrieved, the Cumbrian says: “This conduct I experience is most unjust. I know a Cumberland man in the House of Lords, the Earl of Carlisle or the Earl of Lonsdale; I will go to him; he will never see a Cumberland man ill-treated.” The Cornish man will say: “I will go to Lord of Port Eliot; his family have sacrificed themselves before this for the liberties of Englishmen, and he will get justice done me.”

But, gentlemen, the charge against the House of Lords is that the dignities are hereditary, and we are told that if we have a House of Peers they should be peers for life. There are great authorities in favor of this, and even my noble friend near me [Lord Derby], the other day, gave in his adhesion to a limited application of this principle. Now, gentlemen, in the first place, let me observe that every peer is a peer for life, as he cannot be a peer after his death; but some peers for life are succeeded in their dignities by their children. The question arises, who is most responsible—a peer for life whose dignities are not descendible, or a peer for life whose dignities are hereditary? Now, gentlemen, a peer for life is in a very strong position. He says: “Here I am; I have got power and I will exercise it.” I have no doubt that, on the whole, a

peer for life would exercise it for what he deemed was the public good. Let us hope that. But, after all, he might and could exercise it according to his own will. Nobody can call him to account; he is independent of everybody. But a peer for life whose dignities descend is in a very different position. He has every inducement to study public opinion, and, when he believes it just, to yield; because he naturally feels that if the order to which he belongs is in constant collision with public opinion, the chances are that his dignities will not descend to his posterity.

Therefore, gentlemen, I am not prepared myself to believe that a solution of any difficulties in the public mind on this subject is to be found by creating peers for life. I know there are some philosophers who believe that the best substitute for the House of Lords would be an assembly formed of ex-governors of colonies. I have not sufficient experience on that subject to give a decided opinion upon it. When the Muse of Comedy threw her frolic grace over society, a retired governor was generally one of the characters in every comedy; and the last of our great actors—who, by the way, was a great favorite at Manchester—Mr. Farren, was celebrated for his delineation of the character in question. Whether it be the recollection of that performance or not, I confess I am inclined to believe that an English gentleman—born to business, managing his own estate, administering the affairs of his county, mixing with all classes of his fellowmen, now in the hunting-field, now in the railway direction, unaffected, unostentatious, proud of his ancestors, if they have contributed to the greatness of our common country—is, on the whole, more likely to form a Senator agreeable to English opinion and English taste than any substitute that has yet been produced.

Gentlemen, let me make one observation more on the subject of the House of Lords before I conclude. There is some advantage in political experience. I remember the time when there was a similar outcry against the House of Lords, but much more intense and powerful; and, gentlemen, it arose from the same cause. A Liberal government had been installed in office, with an immense Liberal majority. They proposed some violent measures. The House of Lords modified some, delayed others, and some they threw out. Instantly there was a cry to abolish or to reform the House of Lords, and the greatest popular orator [Daniel O'Connell], that probably ever existed was sent on a pilgrimage over England to excite the people in favor of this opinion. What happened? That happened, gentlemen, which may happen to-morrow! There was a dissolution of Parliament. The great Liberal majority vanished. The balance of parties was restored. It was discovered that the House of Lords had behind them at least half of the English people. We heard no more cries for their abolition or their reform, and before two years more passed England was really governed by the House of Lords, under the wise influence of the Duke of Wellington and the commanding eloquence of Lyndhurst, and such was the enthusiasm of the nation in favor of the second chamber that at every public meeting its health was drunk, with the additional sentiment, for which we are indebted to one of the most distinguished members that ever represented the House of Commons: "Thank God, there is the House of Lords."

Gentlemen, you will, perhaps, not be surprised that, having made some remarks upon the monarchy and the House of Lords, I should say something respecting that House in which I have literally passed the greater part of

my life, and to which I am devotedly attached. It is not likely, therefore, that I should say anything to depreciate the legitimate position and influence of the House of Commons. Gentlemen, it is said that the diminished power of the throne and the assailed authority of the House of Lords are owing to the increased power of the House of Commons, and the new position which of late years, and especially during the last forty years, it has assumed in the English constitution. Gentlemen, the main power of the House of Commons depends upon its command over the public purse, and its control of the public expenditure; and if that power is possessed by a party which has a large majority in the House of Commons, the influence of the House of Commons is proportionately increased, and, under some circumstances, becomes more predominant. But, gentlemen, this power of the House of Commons is not a power which has been created by any reform act, from the days of Lord Grey, in 1832, to 1867. It is the power which the House of Commons has enjoyed for centuries, which it has frequently asserted and sometimes even tyrannically exercised. Gentlemen, the House of Commons represents the constituencies of England, and I am here to show you that no addition to the elements of that constituency has placed the House of Commons in a different position with regard to the throne and the House of Lords from that it has always constitutionally occupied.

Gentlemen, we speak now on this subject with great advantage. We recently have had published authentic documents upon this matter which are highly instructive. We have, for example, just published the census of Great Britain, and we are now in possession of the last registration of voters for the United Kingdom. Gentlemen, it appears

that by the census the population at this time is about 32,000,000. It is shown by the last registration that, after making the usual deductions for deaths, removals, double entries, and so on, the constituency of the United Kingdom may be placed at 2,200,000. So, gentlemen, it at once appears that there are 30,000,000 people in this country who are as much represented by the House of Lords as by the House of Commons, and who, for the protection of their rights, must depend upon them and the majesty of the throne. And now, gentlemen, I will tell you what was done by the last Reform Act.

Lord Grey, in his measure of 1832, which was no doubt a statesmanlike measure, committed a great, and for a time it appeared an irretrievable, error. By that measure he fortified the legitimate influence of the aristocracy, and accorded to the middle classes great and salutary franchises; but he not only made no provision for the representation of the working classes in the Constitution, but he absolutely abolished those ancient franchises which the working classes had peculiarly enjoyed and exercised from time immemorial. Gentlemen, that was the origin of Chartism, and of that electoral uneasiness which existed in this country more or less for thirty years.

The Liberal party, I feel it my duty to say, had not acted fairly by this question. In their adversity they held out hopes to the working classes, but when they had a strong government they laughed their vows to scorn. In 1848 there was a French revolution, and a republic was established. No one can have forgotten what the effect was in this country. I remember the day when not a woman could leave her house in London, and when cannon were planted on Westminster Bridge. When Lord Derby

became Prime Minister affairs had arrived at such a point that it was of the first moment that the question should be sincerely dealt with. He had to encounter great difficulties, but he accomplished his purpose with the support of a united party. And, gentlemen, what has been the result? A year ago there was another revolution in France, and a republic was again established of the most menacing character. What happened in this country? You could not get half a dozen men to assemble in a street and grumble. Why? Because the people had got what they wanted. They were content, and they were grateful.

But, gentlemen the constitution of England is not merely a constitution in State, it is a constitution in Church and State. The wisest sovereigns and statesmen have ever been anxious to connect authority with religion—some to increase their power, some, perhaps, to mitigate its exercise. But the same difficulty has been experienced in effecting this union which has been experienced in forming a second chamber—either the spiritual power has usurped upon the civil, and established a sacerdotal society, or the civil power has invaded successfully the rights of the spiritual, and the ministers of religion have been degraded into stipendiaries of the State and instruments of the government. In England we accomplish this great result by an alliance between Church and State, between two originally independent powers. I will not go into the history of that alliance, which is rather a question for those archæological societies which occasionally amuse and instruct the people of this city. Enough for me that this union was made and has contributed for centuries to the civilization of this country. Gentlemen, there is the same assault against the Church of England and the union between the State and

the Church as there is against the monarchy and against the House of Lords. It is said that the existence of nonconformity proves that the Church is a failure. I draw from these premises an exactly contrary conclusion; and I maintain that to have secured a national profession of faith with the unlimited enjoyment of private judgment in matters spiritual, is the solution of the most difficult problem, and one of the triumphs of civilization.

It is said that the existence of parties in the Church also proves its incompetence. On that matter, too, I entertain a contrary opinion. Parties have always existed in the Church; and some have appealed to them as arguments in favor of its divine institution, because, in the services and doctrines of the Church have been found representatives of every mood in the human mind. Those who are influenced by ceremonies find consolation in forms which secure to them the beauty of holiness. Those who are not satisfied except with enthusiasm find in its ministrations the exaltation they require, while others who believe that the "anchor of faith" can never be safely moored except in the dry sands of reason find a religion within the pale of the Church which can boast of its irrefragable logic and its irresistible evidence.

Gentlemen, I am inclined sometimes to believe that those who advocate the abolition of the union between Church and State have not carefully considered the consequences of such a course. The Church is a powerful corporation of many millions of Her Majesty's subjects, with a consummate organization and wealth which in its aggregate is vast. Restricted and controlled by the State, so powerful a corporation may be only fruitful of public advantage, but it becomes a great question what might be

the consequences of the severance of the controlling tie between these two bodies. The State would be enfeebled, but the Church would probably be strengthened. Whether that is a result to be desired is a grave question for all men. For my own part, I am bound to say that I doubt whether it would be favorable to the cause of civil and religious liberty. I know that there is a common idea that if the union between Church and State was severed, the wealth of the Church would revert to the State; but it would be well to remember that the great proportion of ecclesiastical property is the property of individuals. Take, for example, the fact that the great mass of Church patronage is patronage in the hands of private persons. That you could not touch without compensation to the patrons. You have established that principle in your late Irish bill, where there was very little patronage. And in the present state of the public mind on the subject, there is very little doubt that there would be scarcely a patron in England—irrespective of other aid the Church would receive—who would not dedicate his compensation to the spiritual wants of his neighbors.

It was computed some years ago that the property of the Church in this manner, if the union was terminated, would not be less than between £80,000,000 and £90,000,000, and since that period the amount of private property dedicated to the purposes of the Church has very largely increased. I therefore trust that when the occasion offers for the country to speak out, it will speak out in an unmistakable manner on this subject; and, recognizing the inestimable services of the Church, that it will call upon the government to maintain its union with the State. Upon this subject there is one remark I would make.

Nothing is more surprising to me than the plea on which the present outcry is made against the Church of England. I could not believe that in the nineteenth century the charge against the Church of England should be that churchmen, and especially the clergy, had educated the people. If I were to fix upon one circumstance more than another which redounded to the honor of churchmen, it is that they should fulfil this noble office; and, next to being "the stewards of divine mysteries," I think the greatest distinction of the clergy is the admirable manner in which they have devoted their lives and their fortunes to this greatest of national objects.

Gentlemen, you are well acquainted in this city with this controversy. It was in this city—I don't know whether it was not in this hall—that that remarkable meeting was held of the Nonconformists to effect important alterations in the Education Act, and you are acquainted with the discussion in Parliament which arose in consequence of that meeting. Gentlemen, I have due and great respect for the Nonconformist body. I acknowledge their services to their country, and though I believe that the political reasons which mainly called them into existence have entirely ceased, it is impossible not to treat with consideration a body which has been eminent for its conscience, its learning, and its patriotism; but I must express my mortification that, from a feeling of envy or of pique, the Nonconformist body, rather than assist the Church in its great enterprise, should absolutely have become the partisans of a merely secular education. I believe myself, gentlemen, that without the recognition of a superintending Providence in the affairs of this world all national education will be disastrous, and I feel confident

that it is impossible to stop at that mere recognition. Religious education is demanded by the nation generally and by the instincts of human nature. I should like to see the Church and the Nonconformists work together; but I trust, whatever may be the result, the country will stand by the Church in its efforts to maintain the religious education of the people. Gentlemen, I foresee yet trials for the Church of England; but I am confident in its future. I am confident in its future because I believe there is now a very general feeling that to be national it must be comprehensive. I will not use the word “broad,” because it is an epithet applied to a system with which I have no sympathy. But I would wish churchmen, and especially the clergy, always to remember that in our “Father’s home there are many mansions,” and I believe that comprehensive spirit is perfectly consistent with the maintenance of formularies and the belief in dogmas without which I hold no practical religion can exist.

Gentlemen, I have now endeavored to express to you my general views upon the most important subjects that can interest Englishmen. They are subjects upon which, in my mind, a man should speak with frankness and clearness to his countrymen, and although I do not come down here to make a party speech, I am bound to say that the manner in which those subjects are treated by the leading subject of this realm is to me most unsatisfactory. Although the Prime Minister of England is always writing letters and making speeches, and particularly on these topics, he seems to me ever to send forth an “uncertain sound.” If a member of Parliament announces himself a Republican, Mr. Gladstone takes the earliest opportunity of describing him as a “fellow-worker” in public life. If an inconsiderate

multitude calls for the abolition or reform of the House of Lords, Mr. Gladstone says that it is no easy task, and that he must think once or twice, or perhaps even thrice, before he can undertake it. If your neighbor, the member for Bradford, Mr. Miall, brings forward a motion in the House of Commons for the severance of Church and State, Mr. Gladstone assures Mr. Miall with the utmost courtesy that he believes the opinion of the House of Commons is against him, but that if Mr. Miall wishes to influence the House of Commons he must address the people out of doors; whereupon Mr. Miall immediately calls a public meeting, and alleges as its cause the advice he has just received from the Prime Minister.

But, gentlemen, after all, the test of political institutions is the condition of the country whose fortunes they regulate; and I do not mean to evade that test. You are the inhabitants of an island of no colossal size; which, geographically speaking, was intended by nature as the appendage of some continental empire—either of Gauls and Franks on the other side of the Channel, or of Teutons and Scandinavians beyond the German Sea. Such, indeed, and for a long period, was your early history. You were invaded; you were pillaged, and you were conquered; yet amid all these disgraces and vicissitudes there was gradually formed that English race which has brought about a very different state of affairs. Instead of being invaded, your land is proverbially the only “inviolate land”—“the inviolate land of the sage and free.” Instead of being plundered, you have attracted to your shores all the capital of the world. Instead of being conquered, your flag floats on many waters, and your standard waves in either zone. It may be said that these achievements are due to the race

that inhabited the land, and not to its institutions. Gentlemen, in political institutions are the embodied experiences of a race. You have established a society of classes which give vigor and variety to life. But no class possesses a single exclusive privilege, and all are equal before the law. You possess a real aristocracy, open to all who desire to enter it. You have not merely a middle class, but a hierarchy of middle classes, in which every degree of wealth, refinement, industry, energy, and enterprise is duly represented.

And now, gentlemen, what is the condition of the great body of the people? In the first place, gentlemen, they have for centuries been in the full enjoyment of that which no other country in Europe has ever completely attained—complete rights of personal freedom. In the second place, there has been a gradual, and therefore a wise, distribution on a large scale of political rights. Speaking with reference to the industries of this great part of the country, I can personally contrast it with the condition of the working classes forty years ago. In that period they have attained two results—the raising of their wages and the diminution of their toil. Increased means and increased leisure are the two civilizers of man. That the working classes of Lancashire and Yorkshire have proved not unworthy of these boons may be easily maintained; but their progress and elevation have been during this interval wonderfully aided and assisted by three causes, which are not so distinctively attributable to their own energies. The first is the revolution in locomotion, which has opened the world to the working man, which has enlarged the horizon of his experience, increased his knowledge of nature and of art, and added immensely to the salutary recreation, amusement, and

pleasure of his existence. The second cause is the cheap postage, the moral benefits of which cannot be exaggerated. And the third is that unshackled press which has furnished him with endless sources of instruction, information, and amusement.

Gentlemen, if you would permit me, I would now make an observation upon another class of the laboring population. This is not a civic assembly, although we meet in a city. That was for convenience, but the invitation which I received was to meet the county and all the boroughs of Lancashire; and I wish to make a few observations upon the condition of the agricultural laborer. That is a subject which now greatly attracts public attention. And, in the first place, to prevent any misconception, I beg to express my opinion that an agricultural laborer has as much right to combine for the bettering of his condition as a manufacturing laborer or a worker in metals. If the causes of his combination are natural—that is to say, if they arise from his own feelings and from the necessities of his own condition—the combination will end in results mutually beneficial to employers and employed. If, on the other hand, it is factitious and he is acted upon by extraneous influences and extraneous ideas, the combination will produce, I fear, much loss and misery both to employers and employed; and after a time he will find himself in a similar, or in a worse, position.

Gentlemen, in my opinion, the farmers of England cannot, as a body, afford to pay higher wages than they do, and those who will answer me by saying that they must find their ability by the reduction of rents are, I think, involving themselves with economic laws which may prove too difficult for them to cope with. The profits of a farmer

are very moderate. The interest upon capital invested in land is the smallest that any property furnishes. The farmer will have his profits and the investor in land will have his interest, even though they may be obtained at the cost of changing the mode of the cultivation of the country. Gentlemen, I should deeply regret to see the tillage of this country reduced, and a recurrence to pasture take place. I should regret it principally on account of the agricultural laborers themselves. Their new friends call them Hodge, and describe them as a stolid race. I must say that, from my experience of them, they are sufficiently shrewd and open to reason. I would say to them with confidence, as the great Athenian said to the Spartan who rudely assailed him: “Strike, but hear me.”

First, a change in the cultivation of the soil of this country would be very injurious to the laboring class; and second, I am of opinion that that class, instead of being stationary, has made, if not as much progress as the manufacturing class, very considerable progress during the last forty years. Many persons write and speak about the agricultural laborer with not so perfect a knowledge of his condition as is desirable. They treat him always as a human being who in every part of the country finds himself in an identical condition. Now, on the contrary, there is no class of laborers in which there is greater variety of condition than that of the agricultural laborers. It changes from north to south, from east to west, and from county to county. It changes even in the same county, where there is an alteration of soil and of configuration. The hind in Northumberland is in a very different condition from the famous Dorsetshire laborer; the tiller of the soil in Lincolnshire is different from his fellow-agriculturalist in Sussex. What the effect

of manufactures is upon the agricultural districts in their neighborhood it would be presumption in me to dwell upon; your own experience must tell you whether the agricultural laborer in North Lancashire, for example, has had no rise in wages and no diminution in toil. Take the case of the Dorsetshire laborer—the whole of the agricultural laborers on the southwestern coast of England for a very long period worked only half the time of the laborers in other parts of England, and received only half the wages. In the experience of many, I dare say, who are here present, even thirty years ago a Dorsetshire laborer never worked after three o'clock in the day; and why? Because the whole of that part of England was demoralized by smuggling. No one worked after three o'clock in the day, for a very good reason—because he had to work at night. No farmer allowed his team to be employed after three o'clock, because he reserved his horses to take his illicit cargo at night and carry it rapidly into the interior. Therefore, as the men were employed and remunerated otherwise, they got into a habit of half work and half pay so far as land was concerned, and when smuggling was abolished—and it has only been abolished for thirty years—these imperfect habits of labor continued, and do even now continue to a great extent. That is the origin of the condition of the agricultural laborer in the southwestern part of England.

But now, gentlemen, I want to test the condition of the agricultural laborer generally; and I will take a part of England with which I am familiar, and can speak as to the accuracy of the facts—I mean the group described as the south-midland counties. The conditions of labor there are the same, or pretty nearly the same throughout. The group may be described as a strictly agricultural com-

munity, and they embrace a population of probably a million and a half. Now, I have no hesitation in saying that the improvement in their lot during the last forty years has been progressive and is remarkable. I attribute it to three causes. In the first place, the rise in their money wages is no less than fifteen per cent. The second great cause of their improvement is the almost total disappearance of excessive and exhausting toil, from the general introduction of machinery. I don't know whether I could get a couple of men who could or, if they could, would thresh a load of wheat in my neighborhood. The third great cause which has improved their condition is the very general, not to say universal, institution of allotment grounds. Now, gentlemen, when I find that this has been the course of affairs in our very considerable and strictly agricultural portion of the country, where there have been no exceptional circumstances, like smuggling, to degrade and demoralize the race, I cannot resist the conviction that the condition of the agricultural laborers, instead of being stationary, as we are constantly told by those not acquainted with them, has been one of progressive improvement, and that in those counties—and they are many—where the stimulating influence of a manufacturing neighborhood acts upon the land, the general conclusion at which I arrive is that the agricultural laborer has had his share in the advance of national prosperity. Gentlemen, I am not here to maintain that there is nothing to be done to increase the well-being of the working classes of this country, generally speaking. There is not a single class in the country which is not susceptible of improvement; and that makes the life and animation of our society. But in all we do we must remember, as my noble friend told them at Liverpool, that

much depends upon the working classes themselves; and what I know of the working classes in Lancashire makes me sure that they will respond to this appeal. Much, also, may be expected from that sympathy between classes which is a distinctive feature of the present day; and, in the last place, no inconsiderable results may be obtained by judicious and prudent legislation. But, gentlemen, in attempting to legislate upon social matters, the great object is to be practical—to have before us some distinct aims and some distinct means by which they can be accomplished.

Gentlemen, I think public attention as regards these matters ought to be concentrated upon sanitary legislation. That is a wide subject, and, if properly treated, comprises almost every consideration which has a just claim upon legislative interference. Pure air, pure water, the inspection of unhealthy habitations, the adulteration of food—these and many kindred matters may be legitimately dealt with by the legislature; and I am bound to say the legislature is not idle upon them; for we have at this time two important measures before Parliament on the subject. One—by a late colleague of mine, Sir Charles Adderley—is a large and comprehensive measure, founded upon a sure basis, for it consolidates all existing public acts, and improves them. A prejudice has been raised against that proposal, by stating that it interferes with the private acts of the great towns. I take this opportunity of contradicting that. The bill of Sir Charles Adderley does not touch the acts of the great towns. It only allows them, if they think fit, to avail themselves of its new provisions.

The other measure by the government is of a partial character. What it comprises is good, so far as it goes, but it shrinks from that bold consolidation of existing

acts which I think one of the great merits of Sir Charles Adderley's bill, which permits us to become acquainted with how much may be done in favor of sanitary improvement by existing provisions. Gentlemen, I cannot impress upon you too strongly my conviction of the importance of the legislature and society uniting together in favor of these important results. A great scholar and a great wit, three hundred years ago, said that, in his opinion, there was a great mistake in the Vulgate, which, as you all know, is the Latin translation of the Holy Scriptures, and that, instead of saying "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity"—*Vanitas vanitatum, omnia vanitas*—the wise and witty king really said: "*Sanitas sanitatum, omnia sanitas.*"—Gentlemen, it is impossible to overrate the importance of the subject. After all, the first consideration of a minister should be the health of the people. A land may be covered with historic trophies, with museums of science and galleries of art, with universities and with libraries; the people may be civilized and ingenious; the country may be even famous in the annals and action of the world, but, gentlemen, if the population every ten years decreases, and the stature of the race every ten years diminishes, the history of that country will soon be the history of the past.

Gentlemen, I said I had not come here to make a party speech. I have addressed you upon subjects of grave, and I will venture to believe of general, interest; but to be here and altogether silent upon the present state of public affairs would not be respectful to you, and, perhaps, on the whole, would be thought incongruous. Gentlemen, I cannot pretend that our position either at home or abroad is in my opinion satisfactory. At home; at a period of immense prosperity, with a people contented and naturally loyal,

we find to our surprise the most extravagant doctrines professed and the fundamental principles of our most valuable institutions impugned, and that, too, by persons of some authority. Gentlemen, this startling inconsistency is accounted for, in my mind, by the circumstances under which the present administration was formed. It is the first instance in my knowledge of a British administration being avowedly formed on a principle of violence. It is unnecessary for me to remind you of the circumstances which preceded the formation of that government. You were the principal scene and theatre of the development of statesmanship that then occurred. You witnessed the incubation of the portentous birth. You remember when you were informed that the policy to secure the prosperity of Ireland and the content of Irishmen was a policy of sacrilege and confiscation. Gentlemen, when Ireland was placed under the wise and able administration of Lord Abercorn, Ireland was prosperous, and I may say content. But there happened at that time a very peculiar conjuncture in politics. The Civil War in America had just ceased; and a band of military adventurers—Poles, Italians, and many Irishmen—concocted in New York a conspiracy to invade Ireland, with the belief that the whole country would rise to welcome them. How that conspiracy was baffled—how those plots were confounded, I need not now remind you. For that we were mainly indebted to the eminent qualities of a great man who has just left us. You remember how the constituencies were appealed to to vote against the government which had made so unfit an appointment as that of Lord Mayo to the viceroyalty of India. It was by his great qualities when Secretary for Ireland, by his vigilance, his courage,

his patience, and his perseverance that this conspiracy was defeated. Never was a Minister better informed. He knew what was going on at New York just as well as what was going on in the city of Dublin.

When the Fenian conspiracy had been entirely put down, it became necessary to consider the policy which it was expedient to pursue in Ireland; and it seemed to us at that time that what Ireland required after all the excitement which it had experienced was a policy which should largely develop its material resources. There were one or two subjects of a different character, which, for the advantage of the State, it would have been desirable to have settled, if that could have been effected with a general concurrence of both the great parties in that country. Had we remained in office, that would have been done. But we were destined to quit it, and we quitted it without a murmur. The policy of our successors was different. Their specific was to despoil churches and plunder landlords, and what has been the result? Sedition rampant, treason thinly veiled, and whenever a vacancy occurs in the representation a candidate is returned pledged to the disruption of the realm. Her Majesty's new Ministers proceeded in their career like a body of men under the influence of some delirious drug. Not satiated with the spoliation and anarchy of Ireland, they began to attack every institution and every interest, every class and calling in the country.

It is curious to observe their course. They took into hand the army. What have they done? I will not comment on what they have done. I will historically state it, and leave you to draw the inference. So long as constitutional England has existed there has been a jealousy among

all classes against the existence of a standing army. As our empire expanded, and the existence of a large body of disciplined troops became a necessity, every precaution was taken to prevent the danger to our liberties which a standing army involved.

It was a first principle not to concentrate in the island any overwhelming number of troops, and a considerable portion was distributed in the colonies. Care was taken that the troops generally should be officered by a class of men deeply interested in the property and the liberties of England. So extreme was the jealousy that the relations between that once constitutional force, the militia, and the sovereign were rigidly guarded, and it was carefully placed under local influences. All this is changed. We have a standing army of large amount, quartered and brigaded and encamped permanently in England, and fed by a considerable and constantly increasing reserve.

It will in due time be officered by a class of men eminently scientific, but with no relations necessarily with society; while the militia is withdrawn from all local influences, and placed under the immediate command of the Secretary of War. Thus, in the nineteenth century, we have a large standing army established in England, contrary to all the traditions of the land, and that by a Liberal government, and with the warm acclamations of the Liberal party.

Let us look what they have done with the Admiralty. You remember, in this country especially, the denunciations of the profligate expenditure of the Conservative government, and you have since had an opportunity of comparing it with the gentler burden of Liberal estimates. The navy was not merely an instance of profligate expenditure, but of incompetent and inadequate management. A

great revolution was promised in its administration. A gentleman [Mr. Childers] almost unknown to English politics was strangely preferred to one of the highest places in the councils of her Majesty. He set to at his task with ruthless activity. The Consulative Council, under which Nelson had gained all his victories, was dissolved. The secretaryship of the Admiralty, an office which exercised a complete supervision over every division of that great department—an office which was to the Admiralty what the Secretary of State is to the kingdom—which, in the qualities which it required and the duties which it fulfilled, was rightly a stepping-stone to the Cabinet, as in the instances of Lord Halifax, Lord Herbert, and many others—was reduced to absolute insignificance. Even the office of Control, which of all others required a position of independence, and on which the safety of the navy mainly depended, was deprived of all its important attributes. For two years the Opposition called the attention of Parliament to these destructive changes, but Parliament and the nation were alike insensible. Full of other business, they could not give a thought to what they looked upon merely as captious criticism. It requires a great disaster to command the attention of England; and when the “Captain” was lost, and when they had the detail of the perilous voyage of the “Megara,” then public indignation demanded a complete change in this renovating administration of the navy.

And what has occurred? It is only a few weeks since that in the House of Commons I heard the naval statement made by a new First Lord [Mr. Goschen], and it consisted only of the rescinding of all the revolutionary changes of his predecessor, the mischief of every one of which during the last two years has been pressed upon the attention of

Parliament and the country by that constitutional and necessary body, the Opposition. Gentlemen, it will not do for me—considering the time I have already occupied, and there are still some subjects of importance that must be touched—to dwell upon any of the other similar topics, of which there is a rich abundance. I doubt not there is in this hall more than one farmer who has been alarmed by the suggestion that his agricultural machinery should be taxed. I doubt not there is in this hall more than one publican who remembers that last year an act of Parliament was introduced to denounce him as a “sinner.” I doubt not there are in this hall a widow and an orphan who remember the profligate proposition to plunder their lonely heritage. But, gentlemen, as time advanced it was not difficult to perceive that extravagance was being substituted for energy by the government. The unnatural stimulus was subsiding. Their paroxysms ended in prostration. Some took refuge in melancholy, and their eminent chief alternated between a menace and a sigh. As I sat opposite the Treasury bench the ministers reminded me of one of those marine landscapes not very unusual on the coast of South America. You behold a range of exhausted volcanoes. Not a flame flickers on a single pallid crest. But the situation is still dangerous. There are occasional earthquakes, and ever and anon the dark rumbling of the sea.

But, gentlemen, there is one other topic on which I must touch. If the management of our domestic affairs has been founded upon a principle of violence, that certainly cannot be alleged against the management of our external relations. I know the difficulty of addressing a body of Englishmen on these topics. The very phrase “Foreign Affairs” makes an Englishman convinced that I am about to treat of sub-

jects with which he has no concern. Unhappily the relations of England to the rest of the world, which are "Foreign Affairs," are the matters which most influence his lot. Upon them depends the increase or reduction of taxation. Upon them depends the enjoyment or the embarrassment of his industry. And yet, though so momentous are the consequences of the mismanagement of our foreign relations, no one thinks of them till the mischief occurs and then it is found how the most vital consequences have been occasioned by mere inadvertence.

I will illustrate this point by two anecdotes. Since I have been in public life there has been for this country a great calamity and there is a great danger, and both might have been avoided. The calamity was the Crimean War. You know what were the consequences of the Crimean War: A great addition to your debt, an enormous addition to your taxation, a cost more precious than your treasure—the best blood of England. Half a million of men, I believe, perished in that great undertaking. Nor are the evil consequences of that war adequately described by what I have said. All the disorders and disturbances of Europe, those immense armaments that are an incubus on national industry and the great obstacle to progressive civilization, may be traced and justly attributed to the Crimean War. And yet the Crimean War need never have occurred.

When Lord Derby acceded to office, against his own wishes, in 1852, the Liberal party most unconstitutionally forced him to dissolve Parliament at a certain time by stopping the supplies, or at least by limiting the period for which they were voted. There was not a single reason to justify that course, for Lord Derby had only accepted office, having once declined it, on the renewed application

of his sovereign. The country, at the dissolution, increased the power of the Conservative party, but did not give to Lord Derby a majority, and he had to retire from power. There was not the slightest chance of a Crimean War when he retired from office; but the Emperor of Russia, believing that the successor of Lord Derby was no enemy to Russian aggression in the East, commenced those proceedings, with the result of which you are familiar. I speak of what I know, not of what I believe, but of what I have evidence in my possession to prove—that the Crimean War never would have happened if Lord Derby had remained in office.

The great danger is the present state of our relations with the United States. When I acceded to office I did so, so far as regarded the United States of America, with some advantage. During the whole of the Civil War in America both my noble friend near me and I had maintained a strict and fair neutrality. This was fully appreciated by the government of the United States, and they expressed their wish that with our aid the settlement of all differences between the two governments should be accomplished. They sent here a plenipotentiary, an honorable gentleman, very intelligent and possessing general confidence. My noble friend near me, with great ability, negotiated a treaty for the settlement of all these claims. He was the first minister who proposed to refer them to arbitration, and the treaty was signed by the American Government. It was signed, I think, on November 10, on the eve of the dissolution of Parliament. The borough elections that first occurred proved what would be the fate of the Ministry, and the moment they were known in America the American Government announced that Mr. Reverdy Johnson, the American Minister, had mistaken his instruc-

tions, and they could not present the treaty to the Senate for its sanction—the sanction of which there had been previously no doubt.

But the fact is that, as in the case of the Crimean War, it was supposed that our successors would be favorable to Russian aggression, so it was supposed that by the accession to office of Mr. Gladstone and a gentleman you know well, Mr. Bright, the American claims would be considered in a very different spirit. How they have been considered is a subject which, no doubt, occupies deeply the minds of the people of Lancashire. Now, gentlemen, observe this—the question of the Black Sea involved in the Crimean War, the question of the American claims involved in our negotiations with Mr. Johnson, are the two questions that have again turned up, and have been the two great questions that have been under the management of his government.

How have they treated them? Prince Gortschakoff, thinking he saw an opportunity, announced his determination to break from the Treaty of Paris, and terminate all the conditions hostile to Russia which had been the result of the Crimean War. What was the first movement on the part of our government is at present a mystery. This we know, that they selected the most rising diplomatist of the day and sent him to Prince Bismarck with a declaration that the policy of Russia, if persisted in, was war with England. Now, gentlemen, there was not the slightest chance of Russia going to war with England, and no necessity, as I shall always maintain, of England going to war with Russia. I believe I am not wrong in stating that the Russian Government was prepared to withdraw from the position they had rashly taken; but suddenly her Majesty's

Government, to use a technical phrase, threw over the plenipotentiary, and, instead of threatening war, if the Treaty of Paris were violated, agreed to arrangements by which the violation of that treaty should be sanctioned by England, and, in the form of a congress, showed themselves guaranteeing their own humiliation. That Mr. Odo Russell made no mistake is quite obvious, because he has since been selected to be her Majesty's ambassador at the most important court of Europe. Gentlemen, what will be the consequence of this extraordinary weakness on the part of the British Government it is difficult to foresee. Already we hear that Sebastopol is to be refortified, nor can any man doubt that the entire command of the Black Sea will soon be in the possession of Russia. The time may not be distant when we may hear of the Russian power in the Persian Gulf, and what effect that may have upon the dominions of England and upon those possessions on the productions of which you every year more and more depend, are questions upon which it will be well for you on proper occasions to meditate.

I come now to that question which most deeply interests you at this moment, and that is our relations with the United States. I approved the government referring this question to arbitration. It was only following the policy of Lord Stanley. My noble friend disapproved the negotiations being carried on at Washington. I confess that I would willingly have persuaded myself that this was not a mistake, but reflection has convinced me that my noble friend was right. I remember the successful negotiation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty by Sir Henry Bulwer. I flattered myself that treaties at Washington might be successfully negotiated; but I agree with my noble friend that

his general view was far more sound than my own. But no one, when that commission was sent forth, for a moment could anticipate the course of its conduct under the strict injunctions of the government. We believed that commission was sent to ascertain what points should be submitted to arbitration, to be decided by the principles of the law of nations. We had not the slightest idea that that commission was sent with power and instructions to alter the law of nations itself. When that result was announced, we expressed our entire disapprobation; and yet, trusting to the representations of the government that matters were concluded satisfactorily, we had to decide whether it were wise, if the great result was obtained, to wrangle upon points, however important, such as those to which I have referred.

Gentlemen, it appears that, though all parts of England were ready to make those sacrifices, the two negotiating states—the government of the United Kingdom and the government of the United States—placed a different interpretation upon the treaty when the time had arrived to put its provisions into practice. Gentlemen, in my mind, and in the opinion of my noble friend near me, there was but one course to take under the circumstances, painful as it might be, and that was at once to appeal to the good feeling and good sense of the United States, and, stating the difficulty, to invite confidential conference whether it might not be removed. But her Majesty's Government took a different course. On December 15, her Majesty's government were aware of a contrary interpretation being placed on the Treaty of Washington by the American Government. The Prime Minister received a copy of their counter case, and he confessed he had never read

it. He had a considerable number of copies sent to him to distribute among his colleagues, and you remember, probably, the remarkable statement in which he informed the House that he had distributed those copies to everybody except those for whom they were intended.

Time went on, and the adverse interpretation of the American Government oozed out, and was noticed by the press. Public alarm and public indignation were excited; and it was only seven weeks afterward, on the very eve of the meeting of Parliament—some twenty-four hours before the meeting of Parliament—that her Majesty's Government felt they were absolutely obliged to make a "friendly communication" to the United States that they had arrived at an interpretation of the treaty the reverse of that of the American Government. What was the position of the American Government? Seven weeks had passed without their having received the slightest intimation from her Majesty's Ministers. They had circulated their case throughout the world. They had translated it into every European language. It had been sent to every court and cabinet, to every sovereign and prime minister. It was impossible for the American Government to recede from their position, even if they had believed it to be an erroneous one. And then, to aggravate the difficulty, the Prime Minister goes down to Parliament, declares that there is only one interpretation to be placed on the treaty, and defies and attacks everybody who believes it susceptible of another.

Was there ever such a combination of negligence and blundering? And now, gentlemen, what is about to happen? All we know is that her Majesty's Ministers are doing everything in their power to evade the cognizance

and criticism of Parliament. They have received an answer to their "friendly communication"; of which, I believe, it has been ascertained that the American Government adhere to their interpretation; and yet they prolong the controversy. What is about to occur it is unnecessary for one to predict; but if it be this—if after a fruitless ratioecination worthy of a Schoolman, we ultimately agree so far to the interpretation of the American Government as to submit the whole case to arbitration, with feeble reservation of a protest, if it be decided against us, I venture to say that we shall be entering on a course not more distinguished by its feebleness than by its impending peril. There is before us every prospect of the same incompetence that distinguished our negotiations respecting the independence of the Black Sea; and I fear that there is every chance that this incompetence will be sealed by our ultimately acknowledging these direct claims of the United States, which, both as regards principle and practical results, are fraught with the utmost danger to this country. Gentlemen, don't suppose, because I counsel firmness and decision at the right moment, that I am of that school of statesmen who are favorable to a turbulent and aggressive diplomacy. I have resisted it during a great part of my life. I am not unaware that the relations of England to Europe have undergone a vast change during the century that has just elapsed. The relations of England to Europe are not the same as they were in the days of Lord Chatham or Frederick the Great. The Queen of England has become the sovereign of the most powerful of Oriental States. On the other side of the globe there are now establishments belonging to her, teeming with wealth and population, which will, in due time, exercise their influence over the distribution of power. The old establishments of this

country, now the United States of America, throw their lengthening shades over the Atlantic, which mix with European waters. These are vast and novel elements in the distribution of power. I acknowledge that the policy of England with respect to Europe should be a policy of reserve, but proud reserve; and in answer to those statesmen—those mistaken statesmen—who have intimated the decay of the power of England and the decline of its resources, I express here my confident conviction that there never was a moment in our history when the power of England was so great and her resources so vast and inexhaustible.

And yet, gentlemen, it is not merely our fleets and armies, our powerful artillery, our accumulated capital, and our unlimited credit on which I so much depend, as upon that unbroken spirit of her people, which I believe was never prouder of the imperial country to which they belong. Gentlemen, it is to that spirit that I above all things trust. I look upon the people of Lancashire as fairly representative of the people of England. I think the manner in which they have invited me here, locally a stranger, to receive the expression of their cordial sympathy, and only because they recognize some effort on my part to maintain the greatness of their country, is evidence of the spirit of the land. I must express to you again my deep sense of the generous manner in which you have welcomed me, and in which you have permitted me to express to you my views upon public affairs. Proud of your confidence, and encouraged by your sympathy, I now deliver to you, as my last words, the cause of the Tory party, of the English Constitution, and of the British Empire.

ON THE BERLIN CONGRESS

[On his return from the Berlin Congress Lord Beaconsfield was at the summit of his popularity. Enthusiastic crowds cheered his progress through the city to the Foreign Office, from one of the windows of which he addressed the multitude, saying, "I have brought you peace, but, I trust, peace with honor." These words became memorable. The speech delivered by him July 27, 1878, at the Carlton Club banquet, was a development of that brief address to the people. The Duke of Buccleuch occupied the chair.]

MY LORD DUKE AND GENTLEMEN,—I am sure that you will acquit me of affectation if I say that it is not without emotion that I have received this expression of your good will and sympathy. When I look around this chamber I see the faces of some who entered public life with myself, as my noble friend the noble duke has reminded me, more than forty years ago; I see more whose entrance into public life I witnessed when I had myself gained some experience of it; and lastly, I see those who have only recently entered upon public life and whom it has been my duty and my delight to encourage and to counsel when they entered that public career so characteristic of this country and which is one of the main securities of our liberty and welfare.

My lords and gentlemen, our chairman has referred to my career, like that of all public men in this country, as one of change and vicissitude; but I have been sustained even in the darkest hours of our party by the conviction that I possessed your confidence, I will say your indulgent confidence; for in the long course of my public life, that I may have committed many mistakes is too obvious a truth to touch upon; but that you have been indulgent there is no doubt,

for I can, I hope, I may say proudly, remember that it has been my lot to lead in either House of Parliament this great party for a longer period than has ever fallen to the lot of any public man in the history of this country.

That I have owed that result to your generous indulgence more than to any personal qualities of my own no man is more sensible than myself; but it is a fact that I may recur to with some degree of proud satisfaction. Our noble chairman has referred to the particular occasion which has made me your guest to-day. I attended that high assembly which has recently dispersed with much reluctance. I yielded to the earnest solicitations of my noble friend near me [the Marquis of Salisbury], my colleague in that great enterprise. He thought that my presence might be of use to him in the vast difficulties he had to encounter; but I must say now, as I shall ever say, that to his lot fell the laboring oar in that great work, and that you are, I will not say equally, but more indebted to him than to myself for the satisfactory results which you kindly recognize.

I share the conviction of our noble chairman that it is one which has been received with satisfaction by the country, but I am perfectly aware that that satisfaction is not complete or unanimous, because I know well that before eight and forty hours have passed the marshalled hosts of opposition will be prepared to challenge what has been done and to question the policy we hope we have established.

My lords and gentlemen, as I can no longer raise my voice in that House of Parliament where this contest is to take place, as I sit now in a house where our opponents never unsheath their swords, a house where, although the two chief plenipotentiaries of the Queen sit, they are met only by innuendo and by question, I hope you will permit me, though

with extreme brevity, to touch on one or two of the points which in a few hours may much engage the interest and attention of the Parliament.

My lords and gentlemen, it is difficult to describe the exact meaning of the charge which is brought against the plenipotentiaries of the Queen, as it will be introduced to the House of Commons on Monday. Drawn as it is it appears at first sight to be only a series of congratulatory regrets.

But, my lords and gentlemen, if you penetrate the meaning of this movement it would appear that there are two points in which it is hoped that a successful onset may be made on her Majesty's government, and on those two points and those alone I hope with becoming brevity at this moment perhaps you will allow me to make one or two remarks. It is charged against her Majesty's government that they have particularly deceived and deserted Greece.

Now, my lords and gentlemen, this is a subject which is I think capable of simpler treatment than hitherto it has encountered in public discussion. We have given at all times, in public and in private, to the government of Greece and to all who might influence its decisions but one advice—that on no account should they be induced to interfere in those coming disturbances which two years ago threatened Europe and which concluded in a devastating war. And we gave that advice on these grounds, which appear to me incontestable.

If, as Greece supposed, and as we thought erroneously supposed, the partition of the Ottoman empire was at hand, Greece, morally, geographically, ethnographically, was sure of receiving a considerable allotment of that partition when it took place.

It would be impossible to make a re-settlement of the east

of Europe without largely satisfying the claims of Greece; and great as those claims might be, if that were the case, it was surely unwise in Greece to waste its treasure and its blood.

If, on the other hand, as her Majesty's government believed, the end of this struggle would not be a partition of the Ottoman empire, but that the wisdom and experience of all the powers and governments would come to the conclusion that the existence and strengthening of the Ottoman government was necessary to the peace of Europe, and without it long and sanguinary and intermitting struggles must inevitably take place, it was equally clear to us that when the settlement occurred, all those rebellious tributary principalities that have lavished their best blood and embarrassed their finances for generations would necessarily be but scurvily treated, and that Greece even under this alternative would find that she was wise in following the advice of England and not mixing in a fray so fatal.

Well, my lords and gentlemen, has not the event proved the justice and accuracy of that view? At this moment, though Greece has not interfered, fortunately for herself—though she has not lavished the blood of her citizens and wasted her treasure, under the Treaty of Berlin she has the opportunity of obtaining a greater increase of territory than will be obtained by any of the rebellious principalities that have lavished their blood and wasted their resources in this fierce contest. I should like to see that view answered by those who accuse us of misleading Greece.

We gave to her the best advice; fortunately for Greece she followed it and I will hope that following it with discretion and moderation she will not lose the opportunity we have secured for her in the advantages she may yet reap.

I would make one more remark on this subject which will

soon occupy the attention of many who are here present. It has been said we have misled and deserted Greece because we were the power which took steps that Greece should be heard before the Congress.

Why did we do that?

Because we have ever expressed our opinion that in the elevation of the Greek race—not merely the subjects of the King of Greece—one of the best chances of the improvement of society under the Ottoman rule would be found, and that it was expedient that the rights of the Greek race should be advocated by that portion of it which enjoyed an independent political existence; and all this time, too, let it be recollected that my noble friend was unceasing in his efforts to obtain such a settlement of the claims, or rather, I should say, the desires of Greece with the Porte as would conduce greatly to the advantage of that kingdom. And not without success.

The proposition of Lord Salisbury for the rectification of the frontiers of Greece really includes all that moderate and sensible men could desire; and that was the plan that ultimately was adopted by the Congress and which Greece might avail herself of if there be prudence and moderation in her councils. Let me here make one remark—which indeed is one that applies to other most interesting portions of this great question; it refers to the personal character of the Sultan. From the first the Sultan of Turkey has expressed his desire to deal with Greece in a spirit of friendliness and conciliation. He has been perfectly aware that in the union of the Turkish and Greek races the only balance could be obtained and secured against the Pan-Slavic monopoly which was fast invading the whole of his dominions. Therefore there was every disposition on his part to meet the proposals

of the English government with favor, and he did meet them with favor. Remember the position of that prince. It is almost unprecedented. No prince probably that ever lived has gone through such a series of catastrophes. One of his predecessors commits suicide; his immediate predecessor is subject to a visitation more awful even than suicide. The moment he ascends the throne his ministers are assassinated. A conspiracy breaks out in his own palace, and then he learns that his kingdom is invaded; his armies, however valiant, are defeated, and that the enemy is at his gates; yet with all these trials and during all this period he has never swerved in the expression and I believe the feeling of a desire to deal with Greece in a spirit of friendship. Well, what happened?—what was the last expression of feeling on his part? He is apparently a man whose every impulse is good; however great the difficulties he has to encounter, however evil the influences that may sometimes control him his impulses are good; and where impulses are good there is always hope. He is not a tyrant—he is not dissolute—he is not a bigot or corrupt. What was his last decision?

When my noble friend, not encouraged, I must say by Greece but still continuing his efforts, endeavored to bring to some practical result this question of the frontiers the Sultan said that what he was prepared to do he wished should be looked on as an act of grace on his part, and of the sense of the friendliness of Greece in not attacking him during his troubles; but as a Congress was now to meet he should like to hear the result of the wisdom of the Congress on the subject.

The Congress has now spoken; and though it declared that it did not feel justified in compelling the Sultan to adopt the steps it might think advantageous even for its own interests

the Congress expressed an opinion which I doubt not the Sultan is prepared to consider in the spirit of conciliation he has so often displayed.

And this is the moment when a party for factious purposes, and a party unhappily not limited to England, is egging on Greece to violent courses! I may perhaps have touched at too much length on this topic; but the attacks made on her Majesty's government are nothing compared with the public mischief that may occur if misconception exists on this point.

There is one other point on which I would make a remark, and that is with regard to the Convention of Constantinople of the 4th of June. When I study the catalogue of congratulatory regrets with attention this appears to be the ground on which a great assault is to be made on the government. It is said that we have increased and dangerously increased our responsibilities by that Convention. In the first place I deny that we have increased our responsibilities by that Convention. I maintain that by that Convention we have lessened our responsibilities. Suppose now for example the settlement of Europe had not included the Convention of Constantinople and the occupation of the Isle of Cyprus? Suppose it had been limited to the mere Treaty of Berlin, what under all probable circumstances might then have occurred? In ten, fifteen, it might be in twenty years the power and resources of Russia having revived some quarrel would again have occurred, Bulgarian or otherwise, and in all probability the armies of Russia would have been assailing the Ottoman dominions both in Europe and Asia and enveloping and enclosing the city of Constantinople and its all-powerful position.

Well, what would be the probable conduct under these circumstances of the government of this country whoever the

ministers might be—whatever party might be in power? I fear there might be hesitation for a time—a want of decision—a want of firmness; but no one doubts that ultimately England would have said: “This will never do; we must prevent the conquest of Asia Minor; we must interfere in this matter and arrest the course of Russia.”

No one I am sure in this country who impartially considers this question can for a moment doubt what under any circumstances would have been the course of this country. Well, then, that being the case, I say it is extremely important that this country should take a step beforehand which should indicate what the policy of England would be; that you should not have your ministers meeting in a council chamber, hesitating and doubting, and considering contingencies and then acting at last, but acting perhaps too late.

I say therefore that the responsibilities of this country have not been increased; the responsibilities already existed, though I for one would never shrink from increasing the responsibilities of this country if they are responsibilities which ought to be undertaken. The responsibilities of this country are practically diminished by the course we have taken.

My lords and gentlemen, one of the results of my attending the Congress of Berlin has been to prove what I always suspected to be an absolute fact, that neither the Crimean war nor this horrible devastating war which has just terminated would have taken place if England had spoken with the necessary firmness. Russia has complaints to make against this country that neither in the case of the Crimean war nor on this occasion—and I do not shrink from my share of the responsibility in this matter—was the voice of England so clear and decided as to exercise a due share in the guidance

of European opinion. Well, gentlemen, suppose my noble friend and myself had come back with the Treaty of Berlin, and had not taken the step which is to be questioned within the next eight and forty hours, could we with any self-respect have met our countrymen when they asked, what securities have you made for the peace of Europe?—How far have you diminished the chance of perpetually recurring war on this question of the East by the Treaty of Berlin? Why they could say all we have gained by the Treaty of Berlin is probably the peace of a few years and at the end of that time the same phenomenon will arise and the ministers of England must patch up the affair as well as they could.

That was not the idea of public duty entertained by my noble friend and myself. We thought the time had come when we should take steps which would produce some order out of the anarchy and chaos that had so long prevailed. We asked ourselves, Was it absolutely a necessity that the fairest provinces of the world should be the most devastated and most ill-used, and for this reason that there is no security for life or property so long as that country is in perpetual fear of invasion and aggression?

It was under these circumstances that we recommended the course we have taken, and I believe that the consequence of that policy will tend to and even secure peace and order in a portion of the globe which hitherto has seldom been blessed by these celestial visitants. I hold that we have laid the foundation of a state of affairs which may open a new continent to the civilization of Europe, and that the welfare of the world and the wealth of the world may be increased by availing ourselves of that tranquillity and order which the more intimate connection of England with that country will now produce. But I am sorry to say that, though we taxed

our brains and our thought to establish a policy which might be beneficial to the country, we have not satisfied those who are our critics. I was astonished to learn that the Convention of the 4th of June has been described as an "insane" convention. It is a strong epithet. I do not myself pretend to be as competent a judge of insanity as my right honorable opponent [Mr. Gladstone]. I will not say to the right honorable gentleman "Naviget Anticyram,"¹ but I would put this issue to an English jury—Which do you believe most likely to enter into an insane convention, a body of English gentlemen, honored by the favor and the confidence of their fellow subjects, managing your affairs for five years, I hope with prudence and not altogether without success, or a sophisticated rhetorician, inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity, and gifted with an egotistical imagination that can at all times command an interminable and inconsistent series of arguments to malign an opponent and to glorify himself?

My lords and gentlemen, I leave the decision upon that convention to the Parliament and people of England. I believe that in that policy are deeply laid the seeds of future welfare, not merely to England, but to Europe and to Asia; and confident that the policy we have recommended is one that will be supported by the country, I and those that act with me can endure these attacks.

My lords and gentlemen, let me thank you once more for the manner in which you have welcomed me to-day. These are the rewards of public life that never pall—the sympathy of those who have known you long, who have worked with you long, who have the same opinions upon the policy that ought to be pursued in this great and ancient empire.

¹"Let him set sail for Anticyra." Anticyra was an island much frequented by hypochondriacs on account of the hellebore which grew there.

These are sentiments which no language can sufficiently appreciate—which are a consolation under all circumstances, and the highest reward that a public man can attain. The generous feeling that has prompted you to welcome my colleague and myself on our return to England will inspire and strengthen our efforts to serve our country; and it is not merely that in this welcome you encourage those who are doing their best for what they conceive to be the public interests, but to tell to Europe also that England is a grateful country, and knows how to appreciate the efforts of her public servants, who are resolved to maintain to their utmost the empire of Great Britain.

RICHARD COBDEN



RICHARD COBDEN, English statesman, political economist, peace advocate, and "apostle of free-trade," was born near Midhurst, Sussex, June 3, 1804, and died at London, April 2, 1865. After a rather meagre education, supplemented, however, by assiduous and wide reading, as well as later on by travel, he devoted himself to commerce and became partner in a cotton print works at Manchester in 1830. From 1834 to 1838 he travelled extensively on the continent, visited Egypt, and paid a visit to this country, and in the last-named year he founded with John Bright the Anti-Corn-law League. In 1841, he entered Parliament for Stockport, where he became a man of weight in the House, and in the absorbing topic of the time saw the great battle won in the abolition of the Corn Laws and the conversion to free-trade principles of Sir Robert Peel. In recognition of his able services, in 1846, in procuring the repeal of the duties on imported corn, grain, meal, and flour, he was given a national testimonial, which he had well earned by his tireless devotion to free trade as well as by his clear and forceful reasoning and great power of illuminating his speeches by felicitous illustration. For the following ten years he represented in the Commons the West Riding of York, supporting electoral reform and a peaceful foreign policy. In 1857, his opposition to Palmerston lost him his seat, when he paid another visit to the United States, and on his return to England was chosen to represent Rochdale in the Commons. In 1860, he negotiated with M. Chevalier a commercial treaty with France,—a great and memorable service to his country, as Mr. Gladstone characterized it. For this he was offered a baronetcy and a seat in the Privy Council, but declined these honors, as he hitherto repeatedly declined office. His death was mourned alike in England and in this country, whose cause he stoutly maintained during the era of our Civil War. In Parliament, his close friend Mr. Bright attempted to eulogize his career, but was overcome with emotion and had to resume his seat, intimating to the House as he did so that "he must leave to a calmer moment what he had to say on the life and character of the manliest and gentlest spirit that ever tenanted and quitted human form." In France also many sincere tributes were paid to his memory. He left behind him his "Political Writings," in two volumes, and a collection of "Speeches on Questions of Public Policy."

ON THE CORN LAWS

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, FEBRUARY 24, 1842

SIR,—The right honorable gentleman who has just sat down [Sir Howard Douglas] would have given still greater satisfaction to the House if he had assured us that he would, when he spoke, always keep strictly to the subject-matter under discussion. I must be allowed to say

that my honorable friend the member for Wolverhampton [The Hon. C. P. Villiers] has very just grounds for complaining that in all this discussion, to which I have been listening for seven nights, while there has been much talk of our trade with China and of the war with Syria, while there has been much contest between parties and partisans, there has been very little said upon the question really in hand.

I may safely say that, on the other side, not one speaker has grappled with the question so ably laid down by my honorable friend. That question simply is, how far it is just, honest, and expedient that any tax whatever should be laid upon the food of the people. This is the question we have to decide; and when I heard the right honorable baronet [Sir Robert Peel] so often express the deep sympathy he felt for the working classes; I did expect that he would not have finished his last speech without giving some little consideration to the case of the working man in connection with this question. I will venture to call the attention of the committee to the question of the Bread Tax as connected with the laboring classes, as it bears upon the wages of labor; and I call upon you all to meet me upon neutral ground while we discuss the interests of those working people who have no representatives in this House. As I hear from the other side so many and such strong expressions of sympathy, I call upon them to give practical proof of the existence of that sympathy with the hard laboring population, and not to delay until they are reduced to that state when they can only receive the benefits of your legislation in the abject condition of pauperism.

Sir, in reading, which I have done with some attention, the reports of the debates which took place in 1815, prior to the

passing of the Corn Bill of that year, I have been struck with the observation that all who took part in that discussion agreed on one point of the subject, namely, that the price of food regulated the rate of wages. That principle was not only laid down by one side of the House, but it met with the concurrence of both. Men the most opposite in political opinions I find agreeing upon that principle. Mr. Horner, Mr. Baring, Mr. Frankland Lewis, Mr. Philips, Mr. Western, those who opposed the Corn Law, and those who strenuously advocated its principle, all alike agreed upon the same point, that the price of food regulated the price of labor.

So completely did they agree that one speaker laid down the principle mathematically, and framed a computation in figures to show the relative proportions in which the principle would work, and to what extent the payment of labor would rise or fall in ratio to the rise or fall of the price of food. The same delusions existed amongst the capitalists out of doors. There was a petition presented in 1815, signed by the most intelligent merchants and manufacturers in Manchester, praying that the Corn Law should not pass, because it would so raise the rate of wages that the British manufacturers would no longer be able to compete with those abroad, who had to pay wages so much less in amount. That delusion certainly did then exist; but I have been struck with the deepest sorrow to observe that the minds of many men who bear their part in the discussion now should still be laboring under the same erroneous impression.

The great body of those who legislated in 1815 passed their bill in the honest delusion that the operation of the law would be such as I have described. I believe that if the fact, if the true state of the case had been then known, if they had known what now we know, that law would never have

been passed in 1815. Every party in the House, and many out of doors, were deceived; but there was one party which was not deluded—the party most interested in the question—namely, the working classes. They were not deluded, for they saw with instinctive sagacity, without the aids of learning and education, without the pretence of political wisdom, what would be the operation of the law upon the rate of wages.

Therefore it was, that when that law was passed your House was surrounded by the excited populace of London, and you were compelled to keep back an enraged people from your doors by the point of the bayonet. When that law passed murder ensued. Yes, I call it murder, for a coroner's jury returned a verdict of wilful murder against the soldiers. The disturbances were not confined to London; but throughout the north of England, from 1815 to 1819, when the great meeting took place on Peter's-field, there never was a meeting in the north of England in which banners were not displayed with inscriptions of "No Corn Laws!"

There was no mistake in the minds of the multitudes upon this question. It was always understood by them. Do not let honorable gentlemen suppose that there is any mistake in the minds of the working classes upon this topic. There never was, and there is not now. They may not indeed cry out exclusively for the repeal of the corn laws; they have looked beyond the question, and they have seen at the same time other evils greater than this which they are now calling upon you to remedy; and when they raise the cry of Universal Suffrage and The People's Charter, do not let honorable gentlemen suppose, because the Anti-Corn Law League may, perchance, have run into collision with the

masses upon some points, that the people are consequently favorable to the existence of the corn laws.

What has surprised me more than anything is to find that in this House, where lecturers are, of all men, so much decried, there exists on the other side such an ignorance upon this subject. Yes, I say, an ignorance upon this subject that I never saw equalled in any body of working men in the north of England. Do you think that the fallacy of 1815, which, to my astonishment, I heard put forth in the House last week, namely, that wages rise and fall with the price of food, can prevail with the minds of the working men after the experience of the last three years? Have you not had bread higher during that time than during any three years during the last twenty years?

Yes. Yet during those three years the wages of labor in every branch of industry have suffered a greater decline than in any three years before. Still, honorable gentlemen opposite, with the reports of committees before them, which, if they would take the trouble to consult them, would prove the decline of wages within those three years, are persisting in maintaining the doctrine that the price of food regulates the rate of wages under the belief that this new law will keep up the price of labor. Then I am told that the price of labor in this country is so much higher than the wages abroad that the corn laws must be kept up in order to keep up labor to the proper level.

Sir, I deny that labor in this country is higher paid than on the continent. On the contrary, I am prepared to prove, from documents on the table of your own House, that the price of labor is cheaper here than in any other part of the globe. I hear an expression of dissent on the other side, but I say to honorable gentlemen, when they measure the

labor of an Englishman against the labor of the foreigner, they measure a day's labor indeed with a day's labor, but they forget the relative quality of the labor. I maintain that if quality is to be the test, the labor of England is the cheapest in the world. The committee which sat on machinery in the last session but one demonstrated by their report that labor on the Continent is dearer than in England.

You have proof of it. Were it not so, do you think you would find in Germany, France, or Belgium so many English workmen? Go into any city from Calais to Vienna containing a population of more than 10,000 inhabitants and will you not find numbers of English artisans working side by side with the natives of the place and earning twice as much as they do, or even more? Yet the masters who employ them declare, notwithstanding the pay is higher, that the English labor is cheaper to them than the native labor.

Yet we are told that the object of the manufacturers in repealing the corn laws is to lower wages to the level of the Continent. It was justly said by the honorable member for Kilmarnock that the manufacturers did not require to lower the rate of wages in order to gain high profits. If you want proof of the prosperity of manufacturers you will find it when wages are high; but when wages drop the profits of the manufacturer drop also. I think manufacturers take too intelligent and enlightened a view of their own position and interest to suppose that the impoverishment of the multitudes they employ can promote or increase manufacturing prosperity.

Sir, by deteriorating such a vast population as that employed in manufactures, you run the risk of spoiling not the animal man only, but the intellectual creature also. It is not from the wretched that great things can emanate; it is not a

potato-fed population that ever led the world in arts or arms, in manufactures or commerce. If you want your people to be virtuous or happy, you must take care that they are well fed.

Upon this assumption, then, that the manufacturers want to reduce wages, and upon the assumption that the corn laws keep up the price of labor, we are going to pass a law to tax the food of the hardworking, deserving population! What must be the result? You have heard, from the right honorable baronet [Sir Robert Peel] an answer to the fallacy about our competing with foreign manufacturers. He has told you we export forty or fifty millions. We do then already compete with foreigners. You tax the bones and muscles of your people. You put a double weight upon their shoulders, and then you turn round upon them and tell them to run a race with Germany and France. I would ask, with Mr. Deacon Hume, who has been before quoted in this House, "To whom do the energies of the British people belong? Are they theirs or are they yours?"

Think you that these energies were given to the English people that they might struggle for a bare existence, whilst you take from them half of what they earn? Is this doing justice to the "high-mettled racer"? Why, you don't treat your horses so. You give your cattle food and rest in proportion to their toil, but men in England are now actually treated worse. Yes, tens of thousands of them were last winter treated worse than your dogs and your horses. What is the pretence upon which you tax the people's food? We have been told by the right honorable baronet that the object of the law is to fix a certain price for corn. Since I have been listening to this debate, in which I heard it proposed by a prime minister to fix the price of corn, I doubted

whether or not we had gone back to the days of our Edwards again, and whether we had or had not travelled back some three or four centuries, when they used to fix the price of a table-cloth or a pair of shoes.

What an avocation for a legislator! To fix the price of corn! Why, that should be done in the open market by the dealers. You don't fix the price of cotton, or silk, or iron, or tin. But how are you going to fix this price of corn? Going back some ten years, the right honorable baronet finds the average price of corn is 56s. 10d., and therefore, says he, I propose to keep up the price of wheat from 54s. to 58s. The right honorable baronet's plan means that or nothing.

I have heard something about the prices which it has been proposed by legislation to affix to wheat. I remember that Lord Willoughby D'Eresby said the minimum price ought to be 58s., and I see by the newspapers that the Duke of Buckingham has just announced his opinion that 60s. ought to be the lowest. There is one honorable gentleman in this House who, I hope, will speak on the subject—for I have seen him endeavoring to catch the Speaker's eye—and who has gone a little more into particulars respecting the market price he intends to procure for commodities by act of Parliament. I see in a useful little book called "The Parliamentary Pocket Companion," in which there are some nice little descriptions given of ourselves under the head "Cayley," that that gentleman is described as being the advocate of "such a course of legislation with regard to agriculture as will keep wheat at 64s. a quarter, new milk cheese at 52s. to 60s. per cwt., wool and butter at 1s. per lb. each, and other produce in proportion."

Now it might be very amusing that there were to be found some gentlemen still at large who advocated the principle of

the interposition of Parliament to fix the price at which articles should be sold; but when we find a prime minister coming down to Parliament to avow such principles, it really becomes anything but amusing. I ask the right honorable baronet, and I pause for a reply: Is he prepared to carry out that principle in the articles of cotton and wool?

[Sir Robert Peel: It is impossible to fix the price of food by legislation.]

Then on what are we legislating? I thank the right honorable baronet for his avowal. Perhaps, then, he will oblige us by not trying to do so. Supposing, however, that he will make the attempt, I ask the right honorable gentleman, and again I pause for a reply: Will he try to legislate so as to keep up the prices of cotton, silk, and wool? No reply.

Then we have come to this conclusion—that we are not legislating for the universal people. We are openly avowing that we are met here to legislate for a class against the people. When I consider this I don't marvel, although I have seen it with the deepest regret, and I may add indignation, that we have been surrounded during the course of the debates of the last week by an immense body of police.

I will not let this subject drop, even though I may be greeted with laughter. It is no laughing matter to those who have got no wheat to sell, nor money to purchase it from those who have. If the agriculturists are to have the benefit of a law founded on the calculation of ten years' average, to keep up their price at that average, I ask, are the manufacturers to have it too? Take the manufacturers of the midland counties, the manufacturers of the very articles the agriculturists consume. Their goods have depreciated thirty per cent in the last ten years. Are they to continue to exchange

their commodities for the corn of the landlord, who has the benefit of a law keeping up his price on a calculation of a ten years' average, without the iron manufacturer having the benefit of the same calculation?

I have great doubts whether this is legislation at all. I deny that it is honest legislation. It is no answer for the right honorable baronet to say that he cannot, even if he wished, pass a law to keep up the price of manufactures. It is no satisfaction for being injured by a prime minister to be told that he has not the power, even if he has the will, to make amendment. I only ask him to abstain from doing that for which he cannot make atonement, and surely there is nothing unreasonable in that request. I have but touched upon the skirts of this subject. I ask the right honorable baronet whether, while he fixes the scale of prices to secure the landowners 56s. a quarter, he has got also a sliding scale for wages.

I know but of one class of laborers in this country whose interests are well secured by the sliding scale of corn duties, and that class is the clergy of the Established Church, whose tithes are calculated upon the averages. But I want to know what you will do with the hardworking classes of the community, the laboring artisans, if the price of bread is to be kept up by act of Parliament. Will you give them a law to keep up their rate of wages? You will say that you cannot keep up the rate of wages; but that is no reason why you should pass a law to mulct the working man of one third of the loaf he earns. I know well the way in which the petitions of the hand-loom weavers were received in this House.

"Poor ignorant men," you said, "they know not what they ask, they are not political economists, they do not know that the price of labor, like other commodities, finds its own level

by the ordinary law of supply and demand. We can do nothing for them."

But I ask, then, why do you pass a law to keep up the price of corn, and at the same time say you cannot pass a law to keep up the price of the poor man's labor? This is the point of view in which the country are approaching this question; and the flimsy veil of sophistry you are throwing over the question, and the combination of figures put together and dovetailed to answer a particular purpose will not satisfy the people of England till you show them that you are legislating impartially for the advantage of all classes, and not for the exclusive benefit of one.

What are the pretexts upon which this corn tax is justified? We have heard, in the first place, that there are exclusive burdens borne by the agriculturists. I heard one explanation given of those burdens by a facetious gentleman who sits near me. He said that the only exclusive burden upon the land which he knew of were mortgages. I think the country has a right to know, and indeed I think it would have been no more than what was due to this House if those burdens of which we have heard so much had been named and enumerated.

The answer I heard from the right honorable gentleman [Sir R. Peel] opposite was that there was a great variety of opinions on the subject of these burdens. That I could myself have told the right honorable baronet. As a law is to be framed, founded expressly upon these alleged burdens, it would have been but fair at least to tell us what they are. I shall not enter upon the subject now; but this I will tell the right honorable gentleman, that for every particular burden he can show me as pressing upon the land, I will show him ten exemptions. Yes, ten for his one.

There is one burden that was referred to by the right honorable member for Renfrewshire [Mr. P. M. Stewart], which is the land tax. I am surprised we have not yet got the returns moved for many months since relative to the land tax of other countries. What are our ambassadors and diplomats about that we cannot have the returns of the revenue and expenditure of foreign countries? Our own bureaux must be badly kept or we ought to have this information already here in London. Being without official information, however, I will not run the risk of making a general statement lest I should fall into error. I have, however, one document which is authentic as it is on the authority of M. Humaun, the finance minister of France; and he states that the land tax in that country is forty per cent. on the whole revenue, and twenty-five per cent on the revenue of the proprietors of the soil; so that in France the landowner pays five shillings in the pound, while in this country you have a land tax of £1,900,000, not five per cent. of the income, and you call for a fresh tax upon the poor man's loaf to compensate you for the heavy burden you bear.

I will tell the prime minister that in laying on this tax without first stating his views on this point he is not treating the House and the country with proper respect. I have seen with some satisfaction that admissions have been made (and indeed it has not been denied) that the profits of the bread tax go to the landowners.

Now in all the old committees on agricultural concerns it was alleged that it was a farmer's question—an agricultural laborer's question; and never till lately did I hear it admitted that the bread tax did contribute to the benefit of the landowners on account of those exclusive burdens that are set up as a pretence for its continuance. Ought we not to know what

these burdens were when this Corn Law was passed? Having patiently waited for twenty-five years I think we are entitled at last to a clear explanation of the pretext upon which you tax the food of the people for the acknowledged benefit of the landowners.

The right honorable baronet tells us we must not be dependent upon foreigners for our supply, or that that dependence must be supplementary, that certain years produce enough of corn for the demand, and that we must legislate for the introduction of corn only when it is wanted. Granted. On that point the right honorable baronet and I are perfectly agreed. Let us only legislate, if you please, for the introduction of corn when it is wanted. Exclude it as much as you please when it is not wanted.

But all I supplicate for on the part of the starving people is, that they and not you shall be the judges of when corn is wanted. By what right do you pretend to gauge the appetites and admeasure the wants of millions of people? Why, there is no despotism that ever dreamed of doing anything so monstrous as this; yet you sit here and presume to judge when people want food, dole out your supply when you condescend to think they want it, and stop it when you choose to consider that they have had enough. Are you in a position to judge of the wants of artisans, of hand-loom weavers? you, who never knew the want of a meal in your lives, do you presume to know when the people want bread? Why, in the course of the present debate the right honorable baronet said that from 1832 to 1836 sufficient corn was produced at home for the population, and yet in his last speech he told us that there were 800,000 hand-loom weavers who in 1836 were unable to supply themselves with the commonest wants and necessities of existence, even though they worked sixteen and eighteen

hours a day. Was it not also of that period that Mr. Inglis, the traveller in Ireland, wrote, when he wound up his account of that country by the emphatic and startling declaration that one third part of the population perished prematurely from diseases brought on by the want of the necessaries of life? Yet, in that state of things, the right honorable baronet gravely comes forward and tells us that the country produces a sufficiency of food!

I have heard other admissions too; one in particular by the right honorable paymaster of the forces [Sir E. Knatchbull], who said the landlords were entitled to the Corn Law to enable them to maintain a high station in the land.

[Sir E. Knatchbull: To enable them to maintain their present station in society.]

A noble lord [Lord Stanley] also admitted that the price of food did keep up the rent of land, but did not raise wages. What does that mean but that the rent of land is kept up at the expense of the working classes, who are unrepresented in this House? I say that the right honorable paymaster of the forces and the noble lord do not deal fairly with the people, for they are giving themselves an outdoor relief which they deny to the poor in the union workhouses. It is not merely an extension of the pension list to the landed proprietors, as was said by "The Times" some years ago, when that paper stigmatized the corn laws as an extension of the pension list to the whole of the landed aristocracy; it is the worst form of pauperism; it is the aristocracy submitting to be fed at the expense of the poorest of the poor. If this is to be so, if we are to bow our necks to a landed oligarchy, let things be as they were in ancient Venice; let the nobles inscribe their names in a golden book, and draw their money direct from the exchequer.

It would be better for the people thus to suffer our aristocracy than to circumscribe our trade, destroy our manufactures, and draw the money from the pockets of the poor by indirect and insidious means. Such a course would be more easy for us, and more honest for you. But have the honorable gentlemen who maintain a system like this considered that the people of this country are beginning to understand it a little better than they did?

And do they think that the people with a better understanding of the subject will allow one class not only to tax the rest of the community for their own exclusive advantage, but to be living in a state of splendor upon means obtained by indirect taxation from the pockets of the poor? The right honorable baronet [Sir R. Peel], I apprehend, knows more of the state of the country than most of his followers, and I would exhort him to bear in mind that there is a widespread feeling extending into every part of the country that upon him, and him alone, will rest the responsibility of the manner in which he shall legislate upon this subject.

He has now been in the possession of a great power for many months; he had due warning when he took office of the course it would be necessary for him to pursue. He knows the existing state of commerce and manufactures. He has had ample opportunities of acquainting himself with the actual condition of the people. He is not legislating in the dark, and this I will venture to tell him, that, bad as he finds trade now, he will live (if he follows out the course in which he purposes to embark) to find it much worse. I hope, sincerely hope, that he is prepared for the consequence. We have never heard of an honest English merchant coming forward to say that this law would give him a trade in corn. The corn traders alone have been appealed to.

The right honorable baronet tells us that we must force forward this discussion, that we must proceed at once to the settlement of this question, because, forsooth, he has heard from many corn traders that it is very important that the matter should remain no longer in abeyance. If the trade in corn is still to be left in the hands of a peculiar class of dealers, in the hands of a class who are habitual gamblers, will that be an alteration of the law calculated to mend the situation of those who are engaged in the general trade and commerce of the country? Why should there be corn merchants any more than tea merchants or sugar merchants? Why should not the general merchant be enabled to bring back corn in exchange for his exports as well as cotton, tea, or sugar?

Until you pass a law enabling the merchant to make a direct exchange for corn as well as for other commodities of foreign production you will give no substantial relief to commerce. Nor is your law calculated to lower the price of food. You will have people amongst you maintaining the same wolfish competition to raise the price of bread and you will have capitalists day by day struggling against bankruptcy.

For this state of things the right honorable baronet [Sir Robert Peel] will be responsible. I own, indeed, that I heard in the right honorable baronet's second speech something like an apologetic tone of reasoning; something deprecatory as to his present position, not being able to do all that he would do. That tone would be very well if the right honorable baronet had been forced into the present position by the people or summoned there by the queen; then with some shadow of fairness he might resort to the plea that his position was a difficult one and that he would do more if his party would permit him.

But let me remind the right honorable baronet that he

sought the position he now fills, and though I am no friend, no political partisan, of the noble lord the member for London [Lord John Russell], though I have no desire to see him again in power, governed by his old opinions, this I must say, that the measure which the noble lord proposed upon the Corn Law, though in itself not good, was still infinitely better than that of the right honorable baronet.

And I beg to call to the right honorable baronet's mind that if he is now placed in a situation of difficulty that difficulty was sought by himself and consequently cannot now be pleaded in extenuation of his present measure. He told us at Tamworth that for years and years, aye, even from the passing of the Reform Bill, he had been engaged in reconstructing his party. I presume he knew of what materials that party was composed. I presume he was not ignorant of the fact that it consisted of monopolists of every kind; of monopolists of religion, monopolists of the franchise, monopolists of sugar, monopolists of corn, monopolists of timber, monopolists of coffee.

These were the parties that gathered around him and out of which he was to construct his new Parliament. They were fully alive to the occasion. They set to work to revive the old system of corruption. They bribed and they bought. Yes, they bribed, they bought, and they intimidated until they found themselves in office and the right honorable baronet at their head as their leader and champion.

Did he expect that this party had expended their funds and their labor in the registration courts—for there, as the right honorable baronet himself has stated, I believe the constitution will henceforth be fought—did he think that they had expended this labor and this money in order that they might come into office and assist him to take away their monopolies?

The right honorable baronet must have known the party he had to deal with, for he had a very old connection with them; and therefore I presume he was not disappointed when he came into office, having thrust out men who, with all their faults, were still far better than those who succeeded them.

Having thrown those men out of office and being unable to carry the measure which they proposed and were ready to carry into effect, I say that he has now no right to set up the difficulty of his position as a bar to the universal condemnation which his proposition must receive in the estimation of every just politician in the country. He is the cause, yes, I say he is the cause, of our present position, and upon his shoulders will the people rest the whole of the responsibility.

I will now say a word to the gentlemen on this side of the House who have such great difficulties, such boggings and startings, at the danger of giving their assent to the motion of my honorable friend the member for Wolverhampton [The Hon. C. P. Villiers]. I will say a word or two to the noble lord the member for London [Lord John Russell] and to my noble and right honorable neighbors as to the difficulties of conscience which they appear to entertain about a total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws. I hear on this side of the House, in almost all directions, an acknowledgment of the principle for which I and others contend, that is, the principle of perfect freedom in the trade in corn. But there are some of my noble and right honorable neighbors who think there should be a duty on corn for the purpose of revenue. How can there be a duty for revenue unless it be a duty for protection? I ask my noble and right honorable neighbors who entertain that view of the subject to reconsider it before they go to a division.

With that word of advice to those who sit near me I proceed

to make a remark in reference to the little word "now," about which many gentlemen on this side of the House seem also to feel a considerable difficulty. There are gentlemen here who think that the corn laws ought to be repealed, but they cannot reconcile themselves to the immediate repeal of them. They do not like to repeal them now. "We admit," say they, "the injustice which these laws inflict upon twenty-five millions of the people for the advantage of a select few; but inasmuch as some thousands of persons have a beneficial interest in this wrong inflicted upon the millions, we cannot suddenly deprive them of the advantage they possess."

Now, with all due deference to gentlemen who use that argument, I must be permitted to say that I think they are showing a very great sympathy for the few who are gaining and vastly little sympathy indeed for the many who are suffering from the operation of these laws. I would put it to those gentlemen whether, if it had been in their power, immediately after the passing of the Corn Law in 1815, to repeal that law, they would have given any compensation to the landed interest in the shape of an eight or ten years' diminishing duty upon the importation of foreign grain?

No; they would have repealed them at once. Then, I ask, do they think that twenty-seven years' possession of the wrong—twenty-seven years of exclusive advantage—twenty-seven years of injustice to the rest of the community,—entitles this interested and selfish party to increase its demand in the shape of compensation? I give the honorable gentlemen who are near me credit for being quite sincere in their scruples. I have heard such scruples very often expressed before, but I once heard them met at a public meeting of electors in what appeared to me to be a very satisfactory manner. There was great difficulty on the platform among the Whig gentlemen

who were assembled there about the repeal of the corn laws and they were arguing about the danger and hardship of an immediate repeal of them. They were at length interrupted by a sturdy laboring man in a fustian coat who called out, "Whoi, mun! where's the trouble of taking them off? You put them on all of a ruck," meaning that they had been put on all of a sudden. And so they were. The law was passed without notice in 1815, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the people.

Then I say, let us abolish this law and the sooner the better. I will not trespass further upon the patience of the House. I consider that this question is now drawn within such narrow limits as to depend upon these two points: "Are you, the landed interest, able to show that you are subjected to exclusive burdens?" If so, then the way to relieve you is not to put taxes on the rest of the community, but to remove your burdens. Secondly, "Are you prepared to carry out even-handed justice to the people?" If not your law will not stand; nay, your House itself, if based upon injustice, will not stand!

JOSEPH HOWE



JOSEPH HOWE, Canadian statesman, and lieutenant-governor of Nova Scotia when Confederation had been accomplished, was born near Halifax, Nova Scotia, Dec. 13, 1804, and died in the provincial capital, June 1, 1873. In early years he was employed in a printing office, and later on became proprietor and editor of the "Nova Scotian," and entered the local Assembly in 1836. In 1840-41, he became Speaker of the House, and from 1848 to 1854 was provincial secretary, meanwhile doing much for the development of the maritime province by fostering railway construction, and as leader of the government organizing and aiding in the administration. Early in the sixties, Colonial union began to be talked of in the various sections of British America, together with a project designed to bring them together by constructing an intercolonial railway. While these things were in the air, Howe was for a time supplanted in office by an able politician and speaker, then coming into notice, Dr. (afterward Sir Charles) Tupper. To Tupper, in 1863, Howe handed over his portfolio as provincial secretary; but though he soon after re-entered the Assembly, his own attitude as an opponent of Canadian Confederation gave to Tupper the advantage in British councils and popularity among the Canadian statesmen of the era who were soon to take part in realizing the dream of Union throughout British America. Confederation was carried in 1867, and all that Howe could effect in England, whither he had gone as a delegate from his own Province, far from balking the scheme, as he had designed, was only to secure somewhat "better terms" for his own Province. Though Mr. Howe felt acutely that the case was lost, he was sensible enough to refrain from any hostile course adverse to the measure, and at length accepted Union with good grace, with the portfolio of Secretary of State in the cabinet of Sir John Macdonald. In 1873, he was appointed lieutenant-governor of his own Province, but died before he had well entered upon the duties of his office. He was a man of kindly nature, as well as of honesty of purpose, with an ardent love of country and the faculty of making many and attached friends. He was, however, a hard fighter and a powerful even eloquent speaker, and the embodiment of Liberalism in his political views. His collected "Speeches and Public Letters," together with a work narrating his "Life and Times," were after his death published at St. John, Nova Scotia.

SPEECH BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL
CONVENTION

DELIVERED AT DETROIT ON JULY 14, 1865

I NEVER prayed for the gift of eloquence till now. Although I have passed through a long public life I never was called upon to discuss a question so important in the presence of a body of representative men so large. I see before me merchants who think in millions, and whose daily transactions would sweep the harvest of a Greek island or of a Russian principality. I see before me the men who whiten the ocean and the great lakes with the sails of commerce—who own the railroads, canals, and telegraphs, which spread life and civilization through this great country, making the waste plains fertile and the wilderness to blossom as the rose. I see before me the men whose capital and financial skill form the bulwark and sustain the government in every crisis of affairs.

On either hand I see the gentlemen who control and animate the press, whose laborious vigils mold public sentiment, whose honorable ambition I can estimate from my early connection with the profession. On those benches, sir, or I mistake the intelligence to be read in their faces, sit those who will yet be governors and ministers of state. I may well feel awed in presence of an audience such as this; but the great question which brings us together is worthy of the audience and challenges their grave consideration.

What is that question? Sir, we are here to determine how best we can draw together in the bonds of peace, friendship, and commercial prosperity, the three great branches of the

British family. In the presence of this great theme all petty interests should stand rebuked. We are not dealing with the concerns of a city, a province or a state, but with the future of our race in all time to come. Some reference has been made to "elevators" in your discussions. What we want is an elevator to lift our souls to the height of this great argument. Why should not these three great branches of the family flourish under different systems of government it may be, but forming one grand whole, proud of a common origin and of their advanced civilization? We are taught to reverence the mystery of the Trinity, and our salvation depends on our belief. The clover lifts its trefoil to the evening dew, yet they draw their nourishment from a single stem. Thus distinct and yet united let us live and flourish.

Why should we not? For nearly two thousand years we were one family. Our fathers fought side by side at Hastings and heard the curfew toll. They fought in the same ranks for the sepulchre of our Saviour—in the earlier and later civil wars. We can wear our red and white roses without a blush and glory in the principles those conflicts established. Our common ancestors won the Great Charter and the Bill of Rights—established free Parliaments, the habeas corpus, and trial by jury. Our jurisprudence comes down from Coke and Mansfield to Marshall and Story, rich in knowledge and experience which no man can divide. From Chaucer to Shakespeare our literature is a common inheritance. Tennyson and Longfellow write in one language which is enriched by the genius developed on either side of the Atlantic. In the great navigators from Cortereal to Hudson and in all their "moving accidents by flood and field" we have a common interest.

On this side of the sea we have been largely reinforced by the Germans and the French, but there is strength in both elements. The Germans gave to us the sovereigns who established our freedom and they give to you industry, intelligence, and thrift; and the French who have distinguished themselves in arts and arms for centuries now strengthen the Provinces which the fortune of war decided they could not control.

But it may be said we have been divided by two wars. What then? The noble Saint Lawrence is split in two places, —by Goat Island and by Anticosti,—but it comes down to us from the same springs in the same mountain sides; its waters sweep together past the Pictured Rocks of Lake Superior and encircle in their loving embrace the shores of Huron and Michigan. They are divided at Niagara Falls as we were at the revolutionary war, but they come together again on the peaceful bosom of Ontario. Again they are divided on their passage to the sea, but who thinks of divisions when they lift the keels of commerce or when drawn up to heaven they form the rainbow or the cloud?

It is true that in eighty-five years we have had two wars—but what then? Since the last we have had fifty years of peace, and there have been more people killed in a single campaign in the late civil war than there were in the two national wars between this country and Great Britain. The people of the United States hope to draw together the two conflicting elements and make them one people. And in that task I wish them God speed.

And in the same way I feel that we ought to rule out everything disagreeable in the recollection of our old wars and be united together as one people for all time to come. I see around the doors the flags of the two countries. United as

they are there I would ever have them draped together, fold within fold, and let "their varying tints unite, and form in heaven's light one arch of peace." . . .

The most important question to be considered at this great meeting of the commercial men of North America involves the relations which are to subsist between the inhabitants of the British empire and the citizens of the United States. Before we can deliver a rational judgment upon this question it becomes us to consider what those relations are now. The British government controls the destinies and regulates the trade of two hundred and fifty millions of people distributed over the four quarters of the globe, and in the British Islands alone the machinery in constant running order does the work of eight hundred millions more. Now, in what spirit has the British government, controlling this great empire, dealt in commercial matters with the United States? It has extended to them all the privileges of the most favored nation and has opened up to them, on the most easy terms, the consumption, for everything that they can produce, of all these people. Millions of emigrants and hundreds of millions of money have flowed in here without any attempt, by unwise laws, to dam up the streams of industry and capital. Leaving those of her provinces that have legislatures free to regulate their own tariffs, Great Britain restrains them from discriminating, as against the productions of this country, even in favor of her own. Though burdened with an enormous debt, and always compelled to confront the military monarchies of Europe with a powerful force by land and sea, the people of England prefer to pay direct taxes to burdening commerce with heavy import duties.

Year by year the highest financial skill of the nation has been employed to discover how its tariff could be simplified,

port charges reduced, obsolete regulations removed; and year by year, as trade extends and revenue increases, taxes are reduced or abolished upon articles of prime necessity, consumed by the great body of the people. I notice that some writers in the West complain that wheat is sent into this country from Canada duty free; but it should be remembered that the surplus of all the cereals, ground or unground, is not only admitted to the British Islands duty free from the United States, but to almost if not to all the ports in our widely extended empire. It is sometimes said that because this country admits breadstuffs from Canada, manufactures free of duty should be taken in return. But Great Britain and the Provinces take annually an enormous quantity of bread-stuffs and meat from this country, but do not ask from you the privileges that some persons would claim from us.

In three departments of economic science Great Britain has made advances far outstripping in liberality the policy of this or of any foreign country. France and the United States continue to foster and extend their fisheries by high bounties, but she leaves her people without any special encouragement to meet on the sea and in foreign markets the unfair competition to which they are subjected by this system. Great Britain throws open to the people of this country the coasting trade of the entire empire. . . . I assert that Great Britain, with a liberality which would do honor to any government, has thrown open this whole trade without any restriction. She says to us, if not in so many words, "You are all children of mine, and are dear to me; you are all on the other side of the Atlantic, possessing a common heritage; make the best of it."

Your vessels are permitted to run to Halifax, from Halifax to St. John, from St. John to British Columbia, and from

British Columbia to England, Scotland or Ireland. They are allowed to go coasting around the British empire until they rot. But you do not give us the privilege of coasting anywhere from one end of your Atlantic coast to the other. And now I hope that our friend from Maine will acknowledge that in granting this privilege, with nothing in return, Great Britain gave you a pretty large slice.

When the civil war broke out one half the seaboard of the United States was blockaded, and all the advantages of the reciprocity treaty, so far as the consumption of the ten millions of people in the southern States was a benefit to the Provinces, were withdrawn. Assuming that the treaty runs over ten years, it will be seen that for the whole of that period the people of this country have enjoyed all the benefits for which they stipulated, while the British Americans for one year of the ten have derived no benefits at all, and for four entire years have lost the consumption of one third of the people with whom, by the treaty, they were entitled to trade. Recognizing the political necessities of the period, British subjects have made no complaints of this exclusion, but it ought to be borne in mind now that the whole subject is about to be revised.

Mr. Chairman, let me now turn your attention to some of the topics touched upon by other gentlemen in the course of this three days' debate. Some gentlemen seem to be apprehensive that if this treaty is renewed it will lead to illicit trade along the frontier. For a long time your duties were lower than ours. Mr. Sabine said he was once a smuggler. At that time he could not carry on trade or business at Eastport and be anything else. The traders on the whole coast of Maine were engaged in the same business, and so was Massachusetts; and small blame to them,

The smuggler is a check upon the extravagance of governments or the increase of taxation. Any country that raises its tariff too high or increases its taxation too far will be kept in check by smugglers. The boot was formerly on your leg; it is now perhaps on the other. You have been driven into a war which has created a large expenditure and increased your taxation. It would perhaps pay at this moment to smuggle some articles from the Provinces into this country. You are entitled to defend yourself against it.

But at the same time bear this in mind, that one of the main objections in the maritime Provinces to this treaty was that it gave to your people the power of smuggling. And that power you possess and may use to any extent you please.

Over thousands of miles of coast we cannot afford to keep revenue officers. Down come cutters from Maine with flour, pork, salt, etc., but who can tell what they have in the salt? Why, sir, we sometimes laugh at Yankee notions; one of those is what is called white-eye in the Provinces, a life-destroying spirit which these coasters bring and deluge our coasts with, and it comes in the salt. So in like manner with the tea, tobacco, and manufactures.

Why, a fisherman can land on any part of our five thousand miles of coast, and when challenged by our custom-house officers he can answer that he has a right to land there. The custom-house officer withdraws and the white-eye is landed. And I tell you what we do to adapt ourselves to the circumstances. We are free traders and we maintain our government, have an overflowing treasury, and carry on our public works with a tariff of ten per cent. The only way we can keep out smuggling is to keep our tariff so low as to make it not worth while for any one to smuggle.

Let me now draw your attention for a moment to the value of these North American fisheries. You have behind and around you here boundless prairies, which an all-bountiful Creator annually covers with rich harvests of wheat and corn. The ocean is our prairie, and it stretches away before and around us, and Almighty God, for the sustenance of man, annually replenishes it with fish in myriads that cannot be counted, having a commercial value that no man can estimate. The fecundity of the ocean may be estimated by the fact that the roes of thirty codfish annually replace all the fish that are taken by the British, French, and American fishermen on the banks of Newfoundland. In like manner the schools of mackerel, herring, and of all other fish that swim in the bays and trim around the shores, are replaced year by year. These great storehouses of food can never be exhausted.

But it may be said, does not the free competition which now exists lower the prices? No! Codfish have never been higher in the markets of the world than they were last summer. Herrings are now selling in Baltimore for \$13 a barrel. Thirty years ago I used to buy No. 1 mackerel in Halifax for \$4 a barrel. They now cost \$18, and I have seen them selling since the reciprocity treaty was signed for \$22. The reason of this is, that relative to all other employments, fishing is a perilous and poor business, and that with the progress of settlement and growth of population, in all these great States and Provinces, to say nothing of the increased consumption in Spain, the Mediterranean, the Brazils, and the West Indies,—all that your fishermen and ours can catch will scarcely supply the demand. I placed before the committee a paper, signed by two American merchants carrying on trade in Prince Edward Island, which proves that under

the treaty your mackerel fishery has flourished and expanded to an extent unexampled in its former history.

Taking two years prior to the existence of the treaty, and contrasting them with the last two years, they show that your mackerel fishery has grown from 250 vessels, measuring 18,150 tons, valued at \$750,000, and manned by 2,750 men, and securing a catch worth \$850,000, to 600 vessels, measuring 54,000 tons, employing 9,000 men and securing 315,000 barrels worth \$4,567,500. So with the herring fishery, it is equally prosperous.

I have seen two American seine boats take 500 barrels of herrings, at Baltimore prices worth \$6,500, on the coast of Labrador in a summer afternoon.

The net fishing is also profitable. The bank earns and the mill grinds while the banker and the miller sleep. The fisherman sets his nets at night and finds in the morning that a kind Providence without a miracle, except the "wealth of seas,"—that standing miracle,—has loaded them with a liberal hand. These fisheries, sir, are sufficient for us all. The French, who are anxious to build up a powerful navy, maintain 10,000 men by their bounties in these North American waters, and it is most creditable to our fishermen, that in the face of these bounties and of yours, they have been able, by strict economy and hardy endurance, to wrestle for a share of these ocean treasures to maintain their families and increase their numbers. . . .

I must now touch upon a subject of some delicacy and importance. It has been urged by Mr. Morrill in Congress and by the people of the United States that the treaty ought not to be renewed, because it had bred no friendship toward them across the lakes; that in their struggle the sympathies of the provinces were against them. Well, if that were true

in its fullest extent, which it was not,—if they had not had one sympathizer among the native people and British residents of the provinces, it could fairly be pleaded in response that when Great Britain was at war with Russia the sympathies of the American people were very generally with the latter country. I was in the United States at the time and was perfectly astonished at the feeling. Russia was at that time a country full of slaves, for the serfs had not been emancipated, and England was at war with her to prevent her aggressions upon and making slaves of the weak neighboring countries. How the American people could sympathize with Russia was a perfect puzzle at first sight, and could only be explained in the same manner that much of the sympathy for the South on the part of the British subjects could be explained.

And when the Canadians once had a rebellion within their borders where were the sympathies of the American people then? Were they with the Canadian government or were they with the rebels? Why they (the Americans) not only sympathized with them but, I am sorry to have to say it, they gave them aid along the frontier in many ways, and to a very large extent.

I am happy to have it to say, that during the whole four years of the late rebellion in the United States there has not been developed a particle of evidence to show that a single citizen of any British North American province had put a hostile foot upon your soil.

Everything of which complaint could be made has been the act of your own rebellious people in violation of the hospitality and right of asylum everywhere extended to them on the soil of Great Britain and her dependencies.

I make these remarks in no spirit of anger or of excitement

but to show how unfair it is to hold any government or people responsible for the actions of a few evil-disposed individuals, as well as how natural it was for the sympathy to be aroused in the minds of people on one side or another.

In our rebellion, when its attention was called to their acts, the United States government exerted itself to keep its own citizens within bounds, and all that could have been asked of the provincial authorities has been freely done to prevent any cause of complaint against them. It is something to be able to say, that during the four long, disastrous years of the war just ended not a single act of which complaint could be made has been committed by a Canadian. Notwithstanding the false reports that were circulated I do not believe there was a single intelligent citizen of my Province at least who did not believe that the capture of the "Chesapeake" off the coast of Maine, by rebellious citizens of the United States, was nothing less or more than an act of piracy. And so of the St. Alban's raid.

The government of Canada acted most promptly and nobly in connection with that affair; and has repaid the money which rebellious citizens of the United States had carried into their territory from the States' banks.

As to their harboring the rebels and extending to them the right of asylum, is there a single American here who would have his government surrender that right? There was not an Englishman, nor an Irishman, nor a Scotchman, nor an American who would not fight three wars rather than give up that sacred right. How many excellent citizens of the United States were there among them at this moment, and how many were there who had helped them to fight their battles, who dare not go back to their own native lands across the ocean on account of political offences? The American

people would not give these people up to their respective governments and thus surrender their right of asylum; they would every man of them fight first. It is very proper that criminals should be given up, and a treaty for that purpose has been made between England and the United States. They could sympathize with political offenders but need not sympathize with criminals.

When Abraham Lincoln fell by the hand of the assassin the act was reprobated throughout the provinces as well as throughout the British empire.

But admitting that a large number of people in the Provinces sympathized with the rebels, what of that? Did not a very large number in the northern States sympathize with them? Nobody ever saw two dogs fighting in the street, or two cocks fighting in a back yard, without having his sympathies aroused, he scarcely knew why, in favor of one or the other of the combatants, and generally the weakest. Suppose a good deal of feeling was excited in some portions of the British provinces, was that any good reason for refusing to allow us to trade with our brethren south of the lakes? The sympathy expressed for the South ought to be well balanced by the young men whom they had drawn from the colonies into their conflict.

For one ton of goods sent to the Southerners, and for one young man sent to aid their cause, we have sent fifty tons and fifty able-bodied soldiers to the North. The people of the Provinces might lay the charge against you of having seduced their young men away from their homes and left their bodies bleaching on southern plains or rotting in southern prisons.

Only a short time ago I met no less than thirty British Americans going home on a single vessel, after having served

three years in the war, and having left scores of their companions behind to enrich the soil. At Washington I met with a brave son of one of my colleagues in the legislature of Nova Scotia, who held the rank of lieutenant in a Massachusetts regiment, with only one leg to take back to his home instead of two. I met another veteran from my Province who had fought in twenty battles and was on his way home.

In my own family and person I have suffered not a little by this unhappy rebellion. I have five boys, and one of them took it into his head to enter your army. He has now been for nearly two years in the Twenty-third Ohio regiment, and has fought in all the battles in which that regiment has been engaged during that period. He was in both the great battles under Sheridan, in which Early's forces were scattered and the Shenandoah Valley cleared. All the personal benefit that I have derived from the reciprocity treaty or hope to derive from its renewal will never compensate me or that boy's mother for the anxiety we have had with regard to him; but when he produced the certificates of his commanding officers showing that he had conducted himself like a gentleman and had been faithful and brave it was some consolation for all our anguish to know that he had performed his duty.

I know that it has been asserted by some and I have heard it uttered since I came to the convention that if the reciprocity treaty is annulled the British Provinces will be so cramped that they will be compelled to seek annexation to the United States. I beg to be allowed to say on that point that I know the feeling in the Lower Provinces pretty thoroughly and believe I am well enough acquainted with the Canadians to speak for them also, and I speak for them all, with such

exceptions as must be made when speaking for any entire population, when I make the assertion that no consideration of finance, no question of balance for or against them upon interchange of commodities can have any influence upon the loyalty of the inhabitants of the British Provinces or to tend in the slightest degree to alienate the affections of the people from their country, their institutions, their government and their queen.

There is not a loyal man in the British American Provinces, not a man worthy of the name, who, whatever may happen to the treaty, will become any the less loyal, any the less true to his country on that account. There is not a man who dare, on the abrogation of the treaty, if such should be its fate, take the hustings and appeal to any constituency on annexation principles throughout the entire domain. The man who avows such a sentiment will be scouted from society by his best friends. What other treatment would a man deserve who should turn traitor to his sovereign and his government and violate all obligations to the country which gave him birth?

GIUSEPPE MAZZINI



GIUSEPPE MAZZINI, Italian patriot, revolutionist, and creator of Italian unity, was born at Genoa, June 22, 1805, and died at Pisa, Italy, March 12, 1872. His father was a successful physician, and a professor at the University of Genoa. In 1818, young Giuseppe began to attend classes in the faculty of arts at the university; he afterward studied medicine, with a view to following his father's profession, but finally graduated in law and was admitted to the Bar. During the four years of his nominal connection with his profession, which he regarded with disfavor, in its dry and uninteresting details at least, he wrote a number of essays and reviews. His literary articles soon showed his advanced liberalism in politics, and led to the suppression of two of the newspapers in which they appeared. Having joined the Carbonari, he rose to "one of the higher grades in their hierarchy," but, shortly after the French Revolution of 1830, he was betrayed, while initiating a new member, to the authorities and suffered imprisonment for six months in a fortress, and, when released, it was upon conditions involving so many restrictions upon his liberty that he preferred to leave his country. He accordingly withdrew to France, where he lived chiefly at Marseilles. He now began to shape the programme of the organization which was destined to bear fruit in uniting Italy. In 1832, he organized "La Giovine Italia," or Young Italy party, whose avowed aims were the liberation of Italy both from foreign and internal tyranny and its unification under a republic. Mazzini devoted his life to the promotion of these objects, and lived to see them practically fulfilled in 1859-60, though he was never entirely reconciled to the substitution of a monarchical government for the republic which he preferred. He declined, in 1866, to take advantage of the amnesty, which relieved him from the sentence of death that had been, in early life, pronounced against him. In May, 1869, he was expelled from Switzerland at the instance of the Italian government for having conspired with Garibaldi. After some months spent in England, he set out in 1870 for Sicily, but was arrested at sea and taken to Gaeta, where he was imprisoned for a time. Victor Emmanuel made the birth of a prince the occasion for restoring Mazzini to liberty. The remainder of the agitator's life was spent in London, and at Lugano and Pisa. The Italian Parliament, by a unanimous vote, expressed the national sorrow at his death and admiration for his long and disinterested career. To educate the Italian people in the knowledge of their future, and in the necessity of their acting for themselves against Austria and the Bourbons, and even against partial monarchy on moderate principles, was the design and motive of Mazzini's useful life. For this he also wrote his work, "Royalty and Republicanism in Italy."

TO THE YOUNG MEN OF ITALY

DELIVERED AT MILAN, JULY 25, 1848

WHEN I was commissioned by you, young men, to proffer in this temple a few words sacred to the memory of the brothers Bandiera and their fellow-martyrs at Cosenza, I thought that some of those who heard me might exclaim with noble indignation: "Wherefore lament over the dead? The martyrs of liberty are only worthily honored by winning the battle they have begun; Cosenza, the land where they fell, is enslaved; Venice, the city of their birth, is begirt by foreign foes. Let us emancipate them, and until that moment let no words pass our lips save words of war."

But another thought arose: "Why have we not conquered? Why is it that, while we are fighting for independence in the north of Italy, liberty is perishing in the south? Why is it that a war which should have sprung to the Alps with the bound of a lion has dragged itself along for four months, with the slow uncertain motion of the scorpion surrounded by a circle of fire? How has the rapid and powerful intuition of a people newly arisen to life been converted into the weary helpless effort of the sick man turning from side to side? Ah! had we all arisen in the sanctity of the idea for which our martyrs died; had the holy standard of their faith preceded our youth to battle; had we reached that unity of life which was in them so powerful, and made of our every action a thought, and of our every thought an action; had we de-

voutly gathered up their last words in our hearts, and learned from them that Liberty and Independence are one, that God and the People, the Fatherland and Humanity, are the two inseparable terms of the device of every people striving to become a nation; that Italy can have no true life till she be One, holy in the equality and love of all her children, great in the worship of eternal truth, and consecrated to a lofty mission, a moral priesthood among the peoples of Europe—we should now have had, not war, but victory; Cosenza would not be compelled to venerate the memory of her martyrs in secret, nor Venice be restrained from honoring them with a monument; and we, gathered here together, might gladly invoke their sacred names, without uncertainty as to our future destiny, or a cloud of sadness on our brows, and say to those precursor souls: “Rejoice! for your spirit is incarnate in your brethren, and they are worthy of you.”

The idea which they worshipped, young men, does not as yet shine forth in its full purity and integrity upon your banner. The sublime programme which they, dying, bequeathed to the rising Italian generation, is yours; but mutilated, broken up into fragments by the false doctrines, which, elsewhere overthrown, have taken refuge among us. I look around, and I see the struggles of desperate populations, an alternation of generous rage and of unworthy repose; of shouts for freedom and of formulæ of servitude, throughout all parts of our Peninsula; but the soul of the country, where is it? What unity is there in this unequal and manifold movement—where is the Word that should dominate the hundred diverse and opposing counsels which mislead or seduce the multitude? I hear phrases usurping the national omnipo-

tence—"The Italy of the North—the league of the States—Federative compacts between Princes," but Italy, where is it? Where is the common country, the country which the Bandiera hailed as thrice Initiatrix of a new era of European civilization?

Intoxicated with our first victories, improvident for the future, we forgot the idea revealed by God to those who suffered; and God has punished our forgetfulness by deferring our triumph. The Italian movement, my countrymen, is, by decree of Providence, that of Europe. We arise to give a pledge of moral progress to the European world. But neither political fictions, nor dynastic aggrandizements, nor theories of expediency, can transform or renovate the life of the peoples. Humanity lives and moves through faith; great principles are the guiding stars that lead Europe toward the future. Let us turn to the graves of our martyrs, and ask inspiration of those who died for us all, and we shall find the secret of victory in the adoration of a faith. . The angel of martyrdom and the angel of victory are brothers; but the one looks up to heaven, and the other looks down to earth; and it is when, from epoch to epoch, their glance meets between earth and heaven, that creation is embellished with a new life, and a people arises from the cradle or the tomb, evangelist or prophet.

I will sum up for you in a few words this faith of our martyrs; their external life is known to you all; it is now a matter of history, and I need not recall it to you.

The faith of the brothers Bandiera, which was and is our own, was based upon a few simple incontrovertible truths, which, few, indeed, venture to declare false, but which are, nevertheless, forgotten or betrayed by most:

God and the People.

God at the summit of the social edifice; the people, the universality of our brethren, at the base. God, the Father and Educator; the people, the progressive interpreter of his law.

No true society can exist without a common belief and a common aim. Religion declares the belief and the aim. Politics regulate society in the practical realization of that belief, and prepare the means of attaining that aim. Religion represents the principle, politics the application. There is but one sun in heaven for all the earth. There is one law for all those who people the earth. It is alike the law of the human being and of collective humanity. We are placed here below, not for the capricious exercise of our own individual faculties—our faculties and liberty are the means, not the end—not to work out our own happiness upon earth; happiness can only be reached elsewhere, and there God works for us; but to consecrate our existence to the discovery of a portion of the Divine law; to practice it as far as our individual circumstances and powers allow, and to diffuse the knowledge and love of it among our brethren.

We are here below to labor fraternally to build up the unity of the human family, so that the day may come when it shall represent a single sheepfold with a single shepherd—the spirit of God, the Law.

To aid our search after truth, God has given to us tradition and the voice of our own conscience. Wherever they are opposed, is error. To attain harmony and consistence between the conscience of the individual and the conscience of humanity, no sacrifice is too great. The family, the city, the fatherland; and humanity are but

different spheres in which to exercise our activity and our power of sacrifice toward this great aim. God watches from above the inevitable progress of humanity, and from time to time he raises up the great in genius, in love, in thought, or in action, as priests of his truth, and guides to the multitude on their way.

These principles—indicated in their letters, in their proclamations, and in their conversation—with a profound sense of the mission intrusted by God to the individual and to humanity, were to Attilio and Emilio Bandiera, and their fellow-martyrs, the guide and comfort of a weary life; and, when men and circumstances had alike betrayed them, these principles sustained them in death, in religious serenity and calm certainty of the realization of their immortal hopes for the future of Italy. The immense energy of their souls arose from the intense love which informed their faith. And could they now arise from the grave and speak to you, they would, believe me, address you, though with a power very different from that which is given to me, in counsel not unlike this which I now offer to you.

Love! love is the flight of the soul toward God; toward the great, the sublime, and the beautiful, which are the shadow of God upon earth. Love your family, the partner of your life, those around you ready to share your joys and sorrows; love the dead who were dear to you and to whom you were dear. But let your love be the love taught you by Dante and by us—the love of souls that aspire together; do not grovel on the earth in search of a felicity which it is not the destiny of the creature to reach here below; do not yield to a delusion which inevitably would degrade you into egotism. To love is to

give and take a promise for the future. God has given us love, that the weary soul may give and receive support upon the way of life. It is a flower springing up on the path of duty; but it cannot change its course. Purify, strengthen, and improve yourselves by loving. Act always—even at the price of increasing her earthly trials—so that the sister soul united to your own may never need, here or elsewhere, to blush through you or for you. The time will come when, from the height of a new life, embracing the whole past and comprehending its secret, you will smile together at the sorrows you have endured, the trials you have overcome.

Love your country. Your country is the land where your parents sleep, where is spoken that language in which the chosen of your heart, blushing, whispered the first word of love; it is the home that God has given you, that, by striving to perfect yourselves therein, you may prepare to ascend to Him. It is your name, your glory, your sign among the people. Give to it your thoughts, your counsels, your blood. Raise it up, great and beautiful as it was foretold by our great men, and see that you leave it uncontaminated by any trace of falsehood or of servitude; unprofaned by dismemberment. Let it be one, as the thought of God. You are twenty-five millions of men, endowed with active, splendid faculties; possessing a tradition of glory the envy of the nations of Europe. An immense future is before you; you lift your eyes to the loveliest heaven, and around you smiles the loveliest land in Europe; you are encircled by the Alps and the sea, boundaries traced out by the finger of God for a people of giants—you are bound to be such, or nothing. Let not a man of that twenty-five millions re-

main excluded from the fraternal bond destined to join you together; let not a glance be raised to that heaven which is not the glance of a free man. Let Rome be the ark of your redemption, the temple of your nation. Has she not twice been the temple of the destinies of Europe? In Rome two distinct worlds, the Pagan and the Papal, are superposed like the double jewels of a diadem; draw from these a third world greater than the two. From Rome, the holy city, the city of love (*Amor*), the purest and wisest among you, elected by the vote and fortified by the inspiration of a whole people, shall dictate the Pact that shall make us one, and represent us in the future alliance of the peoples. Until then you will either have no country, or have her contaminated and profaned.

Love humanity. You can only ascertain your own mission from the aim set by God before humanity at large. God has given you your country as cradle, and humanity as mother; you cannot rightly love your brethren of the cradle if you love not the common mother. Beyond the Alps, beyond the sea, are other peoples now fighting or preparing to fight the holy fight of independence, of nationality, of liberty; other peoples striving by different routes to reach the same goal—improvement, association, and the foundation of an authority which shall put an end to moral anarchy and re-link earth to heaven; an authority which mankind may love and obey without remorse or shame. Unite with them; they will unite with you. Do not invoke their aid where your single arm will suffice to conquer; but say to them that the hour will shortly sound for a terrible struggle between right and blind force, and that in that hour you will ever be found with those who have raised the same banner as yourselves.

And love, young men, love and venerate the ideal. The ideal is the word of God. High above every country, high above humanity, is the country of the spirit, the city of the soul, in which all are brethren who believe in the inviolability of thought and in the dignity of our immortal soul; and the baptism of this fraternity is martyrdom. From that high sphere spring the principles which alone can redeem the peoples. Arise for the sake of these, and not from impatience of suffering or dread of evil. Anger, pride, ambition, and the desire of material prosperity, are arms common alike to the peoples and their oppressors, and even should you conquer with these to-day, you would fall again to-morrow; but principles belong to the peoples alone, and their oppressors can find no arms to oppose them. Adore enthusiasm, the dreams of the virgin soul, and the visions of early youth, for they are a perfume of paradise which the soul retains in issuing from the hands of its Creator. Respect, above all things, your conscience; have upon your lips the truth implanted by God in your hearts, and, while laboring in harmony, even with those who differ from you, in all that tends to the emancipation of our soil, yet ever bear your own banner erect and boldly promulgate your own faith.

Such words, young men, would the martyrs of Cosenza have spoken, had they been living among you; and here, where it may be that invoked by our love, their holy spirits hover near us, I call upon you to gather them up in your hearts and to make of them a treasure amid the storms that yet threaten you; storms which, with the name of our martyrs on your lips and their faith in your hearts, you will overcome.

God be with you, and bless Italy!

DAVID DUDLEY FIELD



DAVID DUDLEY FIELD, American jurist, one of the greatest lawyers that America has produced, was the son of the Rev. D. D. Field, a Congregational clergyman of Stockbridge, Mass. He was born at Haddam, Conn., Feb. 13, 1805, and died at New York, April 13, 1894. Educated at Williams College, he afterward studied law and, being admitted to the Bar in 1828, began the practice of his profession in New York city, where he soon won for himself a foremost place in the legal profession. He early took interest in the subject of law reform, and being appointed in 1847 one of a commission to reform legal practice in New York State, at once began the preparation of a civil and a criminal code of procedure. The civil code, when completed, was in the main adopted, not only by his own State, but by nearly thirty other States, and it now forms the basis of practice in several English colonies. In 1857, he was placed at the head of a commission to codify the whole law of his State. In 1865, this commission reported civil, penal, and political codes, almost wholly the work of Field, the codes covering the entire practice of common and statute law in the United States. At a meeting of the British Association at Manchester, England, in 1866, Mr. Field brought forward a proposition to frame an international code. In 1877, Mr. Field was a representative in Congress, and in 1890, having meanwhile retired from practice, he presided over a peace convention in London. His writings include "What Shall be Done with the Practice of the Courts?" (1847); "The Electoral Votes of New York" (1870); "Speeches, Arguments, and Miscellaneous Papers" (1890), and an earlier work, issued in 1872, entitled "Draft Outlines of an International Code"—which was translated into French and Italian and enjoyed a wide circulation.

AN INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ARBITRATION

AN ADDRESS BEFORE THE BRITISH SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION
AT MANCHESTER, OCTOBER 5, 1866

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN,—Standing for the first time before the members of this association I must begin by making my acknowledgments for the honor which you conferred upon me some years ago by electing me a corresponding member. Though I have not been able to take part in your meetings I have felt scarcely less interest in them than if I were present and even take to
(234)

myself a share of the self-congratulation which the actual participators must have felt. If I have not contributed to your transactions I have been a humble sharer in the fame which the contributions of others have won.

The distinction which your association has earned is, however, the least of its honors. The good which it has done in stimulating inquiry, concentrating opinion and combining efforts toward the improvement of the law and the education and health of the people would be a sufficient reward for all your labors even if no distinction had been obtained.

The scope of your labors is not confined to your own country; it extends to every part of Christendom. So intimate is now the connection between all Christian nations that the social progress of one is sure to be felt more or less in the others. More especially is this true of your country and mine. We are bound together by so many ties that, forgetting for the present all things else, I will only think of the good we may do each other and the spirit of kindliness we may both promote.

The particular subject to which I am to bespeak your attention is international law. In discoursing of it my purpose will be to answer, so far as I may be able, these questions: 1. What is that which is called international law? 2. Who made it? 3. Who enforce it? 4. Are any changes in it desirable? 5. If so, how can they be effected?

Law is a rule of property and of conduct prescribed by sovereign power. In strictness, therefore, there is no such thing as a human law binding the nations, since they have no human superior. They may however, as they have in part done, agree among themselves upon certain rules, both of property and of conduct, by which they will pledge themselves to regulate their own conduct toward each other and the conduct of their

citizens respectively. These rules form what is called sometimes international law and sometimes the law of nations.

Neither expression is precisely accurate. There is a body of rules more or less distinctly stated by which nations profess to comport themselves in their relations with each other; but they are not laws nor are they imposed upon nations nor yet are they international. They are laws only in each state so far as they are promulgated by the sovereign power of that state and they serve international purposes.

Take for example a treaty concluded between the United States and Great Britain; when ratified and promulgated by the treaty-making power in the two nations it becomes a rule for both by virtue of their compact, and a rule in each nation for its own citizens by virtue of the promulgation by its own sovereign authority.

For want however of a better designation and adopting the suggestion of Bentham, publicists and statesmen now generally refer to this body of rules as international law. If the word law is to be retained I should have thought the expression public law or the public law of the world a better one.

Who made these rules, or this international law if you so call it, is explained by the definition which I have given. It was made by the nations themselves either through express compact with each other or through general practice; that is to say by treaty or by usage. Publicists I know, looking beyond the rules so made or sanctioned, have sought, in those moral precepts by which nations not less than individuals ought to be governed in their intercourse with each other, for guides in other circumstances; and statesmen and diplomats have often fortified their arguments by reference to such opinions and it has thus frequently happened that those precepts have been gradually adopted into the usage of nations.

These views of the publicists are however to be regarded rather as suggestions of what ought to be the conduct of nations in particular circumstances than as a statement of established rules. They are entitled to the same weight in the decision of a national dispute as a treatise on natural law is entitled to in the decision of a case by the courts of America or England.

Some writers are in the habit of treating the law of nations as if it were something above the nations and having an authority superior to their will. In our late civil war, for example, it became the practice of certain persons to speak of the law of nations as a guide or warrant for the Executive in the conduct of the war, beyond the constitution, and paramount to acts of Congress. This, I apprehend, was a mistaken view. The law of nations is only such because each individual nation adopts it, and so far only as it is thus adopted. It is legally, I do not say morally, or without just complaint from other nations, competent for any nation to reject the whole or any part of it as far as its own citizens are concerned. The Parliament of England might enact, if it would, that no English court should decide and no English subject act in a particular manner; even though that manner were enjoined by the law of nations as understood by the whole body of Christendom.

Who enforce the rules thus made or sanctioned and known as international law? The nations themselves, first by applying them as occasion requires to litigants in the national tribunals; and secondly, by punishing the nation which infringes them in such manner as nations may punish each other; that is to say, by non-intercourse, or by force.

The controversies respecting captures by land or sea and the questions concerning the responsibility of individuals for the

violation of private rights are of course determined by the courts, and where the municipal law is silent international usage is the rule of decision. When a question arises between nations it is debated and arranged between themselves, or submitted to arbiters, or decided by force.

The next question will lead us into a large discussion. Are any changes desirable in these rules of international obligation? The slightest acquaintance with the disputes which have arisen and do so constantly arise between nations will convince us that the rules themselves are full of uncertainty and in many respects defective. If we make for ourselves an examination, even incomplete, of the subjects which fall within the scope of international law we perceive at once how many of them are uncertain or require revision. Within it are embraced all the rules which should govern the relations of states with each other in peace and in war. All of them spring from the intercourse of nations.

If a people shut themselves up from others, as the Chinese attempted to do, building a wall between themselves and their neighbors, there can be no international law as there can be no international relations. That condition, however, is unnatural and irrational.

Man is a social being and his nature impels him to intercourse with all the family of man. Whether this intercourse is demandable as a right, and if so when and by whom and upon what conditions and how it should be carried on, are the first questions which present themselves. From intercourse as from a source spring the rights and duties of those who carry it on, making it necessary to determine how far they who pass from one country to another retain their own nationality and to what extent they subject themselves to the jurisdiction of the country which they enter. Hence arise

the questions respecting the right of foreigners to liberty of religion, residence, and trade; their obligations to civil or military service; the liability of their property to taxation or other imposition, and its devolution when they die.

Traffic brings with it contracts. These are to be expounded and enforced in different nations and between the citizens of all. Thence comes that department of jurisprudence which, under the general title of the conflict of laws has engaged so many minds and led to such profound investigations.

The intercourse of nations is public or private. The former is carried on by embassies, legations, and consulates. Here is required a large body of rules declaring the rights and duties of public ministers and consuls, with their attendants, their reception, residence, functions, and immunities.

When private persons pass from one country to another they go either for transient purposes or for permanent residence. In the latter case there arise two opposite claims; on one hand that of expatriation and on the other that of perpetual allegiance. Fugitives from one country into another have certain privileges; hence the practice of extradition, as modified by that right of asylum which, older than Christianity, has been exalted by its spirit and precepts and which it is the honorable boast of your country and mine never to have violated or rejected.

The instruments of intercourse by sea; ships and those who navigate them; and they who pass and repass with them, and that which they carry; the control of them on the ocean and in port—all these are to be regulated by that body of rules of which I am speaking. Next are those rights of property which, acquired in one country, should be recognized and respected in another; the title to personal chattels and the title,

quite as good, in my opinion, to the products of the mind; inventions for which patents are commonly issued; and writings, for which the law of copyright provides, or should provide, a sanction and a guarantee. Then there are the subjects of weights, measures, money, and postal service, which fall within the scope of international regulation. Passing from direct intercourse between nations to their rights, exclusive or concurrent, to things outside of themselves, we come to the subjects of the free navigation of the ocean, the fisheries, the discovery and colonization of islands and continents, and the right of one nation to an outlet for itself through the close seas or rivers of another.

After these various topics regarding the relations of nations in a state of peace we come to those of a state of hostility. Force or constraint is applied in three ways—one by non-intercourse, another by reprisal, and a third by war. I will speak only of the relations in war. First, in respect to intestine or civil war: when and how far may other nations interfere, and when may interference go so far as to recognize a new nation out of the fragments of a broken one, and what is the effect of the separation upon the citizen of the different parts of the divided nation and upon the citizen of other states.

Then in respect to foreign war, when it is justifiable, what must be done to avoid it, and what formalities must precede it. And when it comes what must be the conduct first of the belligerents and then of neutral nations; and in respect to the former who may attack, who and what may be attacked, and in what manner may the attacks be made. Those questions being answered embrace the whole subject of belligerent rights. But into what an infinitude of subdivisions do these topics divide themselves; explaining to what extent

it may be truly said that upon the breaking out of a war all the citizens of one belligerent state become the enemies of all the citizens of the other; what may be done by one side to the citizens and property of the other, including the seizure and confiscation of debts or other property; how the persons and property of the enemy found in a country in the beginning of a war may be treated; whether private citizens, without commission from the government, may assail the enemy; whether it be lawful to take or destroy private property on land or sea; whether all kinds of public property may be taken or destroyed; how public buildings and monuments of art are to be treated; what is the effect of war upon pending contracts; and what future traffic may be carried on between the citizens of the belligerent nations.

Then, when we proceed to consider the conduct of armies toward each other, what are the rules of honorable warfare, what stratagems are allowable, the proper treatment of prisoners, the disposition of spies, the flag of truce, the armistice, and the exchange of prisoners of war—all these are subjects of international regulation.

Turning from belligerents to neutrals we come to consider what are the rights and what the obligations of the latter; what are the conditions of a true neutrality; what is a just blockade, and the effect of it; what things are contraband of war; and to what extent a belligerent may be supplied from neutral territory. When a state departs from its neutrality and becomes an ally, the rights which then attach to her and arise against her form another department of the rules which determine the relations and the rights of states.

This rapid and imperfect enumeration of the principal subjects embraced within the scope of international law will suggest to those who are conversant with them the uncertainty

which hangs about many of them and the need of numerous amendments. Let us refer to some by way of example.

Take the case of recapture at sea. America has one rule, England has another, while France, Spain, Portugal, Holland, Denmark, and Sweden have each a rule different from either and different from each other. It was in reference to such a case that Sir William Scott, the great admiralty judge, whose judgments command respect for their ability, even when they do not win assent to their conclusions, was obliged thus to speak:

“When I say the true rule I mean only the rule to which civilized nations according to just principles ought to adhere, for the moment you admit, as admitted it must be, that the practice of nations is various, you admit that there is no rule operating with the proper force and authority of a general law.”

Take the question respecting the effect of a declaration of war upon the persons and property of an enemy found in the country at the time. How important that it should be settled beforehand by a uniform rule! And yet the practice of nations is various, more various even than the nations themselves; for in the same nation the practice has varied with the interest or caprice of rulers.

You had a controversy with the Great Frederick about the confiscation of the Silesian loan. The seizure of French ships in your ports, upon the rupture of the Peace of Amiens, and the detention by Napoleon of English subjects found in France, produced an immense amount of suffering, which might have been in great part avoided by the establishment beforehand of a proper rule. What articles are contraband of war ought to be settled and everywhere known. But you

do not agree with us respecting them; you do not agree with most of the continental nations.

There must, however, be some rule founded upon just principles to which intelligent and impartial publicists and statesmen would give their assent, could they but approach the subject in a time of peace undisturbed by passions and enmities.

The vexed questions respecting the right of neutrals to send goods by the ships of a belligerent, or to carry the goods of a belligerent in their own neutral ships—questions illustrated by the formulas, “free ships, free goods,” and “enemies’ ships, enemies’ goods”—are matters in which the trade of the whole civilized world is interested, and yet how unsettled! The obligations of a true neutrality, what are they? Do they permit the supply to a belligerent of ships and munitions of war? Do they require a neutral to prevent the fitting out and sailing of ships? Do they require a neutral to disarm and arrest bands of professed travellers or emigrants who are seeking to pass the border, with the real intent of making a hostile incursion?

Take the case of the “Alabama,” to which I refer for no other purpose than illustration. Here is an instance where the people of my country think that you are responsible for all the damage done by that vessel. Your own people, I am told, are of a contrary opinion. Ought such a question to be in doubt; or, rather, ought there to be any such question at all? The security of property and the peace of nations require that there should be none such hereafter. Then there are grave questions respecting the doctrines of expatriation and allegiance, which have given rise to some misunderstanding already and which may give rise to greater misunderstanding hereafter. . . .

Whatever those stipulations might be, whether providing for an arbitration before an appeal to arms or for some other means of adjustment, the same stipulations which would be inserted in a treaty between our two countries could be inserted also in treaties between them and others. Is it too much to hope that by this means the time may come when it would be held impious for a nation to rush into war without first resorting to remonstrance, negotiation, and offer of mediation?

Supposing, however, war to become inevitable and two nations at last engaging in actual hostilities, how much may be done in favor of humanity and civilization by adding to the rules which the usages of nations have established for mitigating the ferocity and distress of war!

Could not private war and war upon private property be forever abolished? Could not more be done in the same direction as that taken by the late conference at Geneva, which produced such excellent effect during the last contest in Germany in exempting surgeons and nurses from capture? Could not the sack of a captured city or the bombardment of a defenceless town be forever prohibited? Might not such transactions as the storming of Magdeburg and San Sebastian and the bombardment of Valparaiso be made violations of the laws of war? Could there not be a great improvement upon the rules which provide for the proper treatment and exchange of prisoners? What indeed might not be effected if an earnest effort were made to lessen to the utmost its evils before the passions become aroused by the actual conflict of arms? Discarding at once the theory that it is lawful to do everything which may harass your enemy, with a view of making the war as short as possible—a theory worthy only of savages and carried out to its logical conclusion leading to

indiscriminate fire and slaughter, even of women and children—the aim should be, while not diminishing the efficiency of armies against each other, to ward off their blows as much as possible from all others than the actual combatants.

How can these changes so desirable in themselves be effected? I answer, by the adoption of an international code. Every consideration which serves to show the practicability and expediency of reducing to a code the laws of a single nation applies with equal force to a code of those international rules which govern the intercourse of nations. And there are many grave considerations in addition. The only substitute for a code of national law—an imperfect substitute, as I think it—is judiciary or judge-made law. This is tolerable, as we know from having endured it so long, where there is but one body of magistrates having authority to make it.

But when the judges of each nation, having no common source of power and not acting in concert, make the laws they will inevitably fall into different paths and establish different rules. And when they do there is no common legislature to reconcile their discrepancies or rectify their rules. Indeed, if there is ever to be a uniform system of international regulations made known beforehand for the guidance of men it must be by a means of an international code.

How can such a code be made and adopted? Two methods present themselves as possible: one a conference of diplomats to negotiate and sign a series of treaties forming the titles and chapters of a code; the other the preparation by a committee of publicists of a code which shall embody the matured judgment of the best thinkers and most accomplished jurists, and then procuring the sanction of the different nations. The latter method appears to me the more feasible.

The difficulties in the way will arise, not in the labor of

preparation but in procuring the assent; yet, great as are these difficulties, and I do not underrate them, I believe they would be found not insurmountable, and that the obstacles and delays which the rivalries of parties and the jealousies of nations might interpose would finally give way before the matured judgment of reflecting and impartial men.

The importance of the work is so great, and the benefits that will result from it in promoting beneficial intercourse, protecting individual rights, settling disputes, and lessening the chances of war are so manifest, that when once a uniform system of rules desirable in themselves is reduced to form and spread before the eye it will commend itself to favor and the governments, which after all are but the agents of the public will, must at last give it their sanction.

Let us suppose this association to make the beginning. There is no agency more appropriate and no time more fitting. You might appoint at first a committee of the association to prepare the outlines of such a code to be submitted at the next annual meeting. At that time subject this outline to a careful examination, invite afterwards a conference of committees from other bodies—from the French Institute, the professors of universities, the most renowned publicists—to revise and perfect that which had been thus prepared. The work would then be as perfect as the ablest jurists and scholars of our time could make it. Thus prepared and recommended it would of itself command respect and would inevitably win its way. It would carry with it all the authority which the names of those concerned in its formation could give. It would stand above the treatise of any single publicist; nay, above all the treatises of all the publicists that have ever written.

Is it a vain thing to suppose that such a work would finally

win the assent one by one of those nations which now stand in the front rank of the world, and which of course are more than others under the influence of intelligent and educated men? The times are favorable; more favorable indeed than any which have occurred since the beginning of the Christian era. Intercourse has increased beyond all precedent and the tendency of intercourse is to produce assimilation. When they who were separated come to see each other more and know each other better they compare conditions and opinions; each takes from each and differences gradually lessen.

Thus it has happened in respect to the arts and in respect to laws, manners, and language. In a rude state of society when men are divided into many tribes each tribe has a language of its own; but as time melts them into one a common language takes the place of the many. Your own island furnishes a familiar example of the influence of intercourse in blending together different elements and forming a united whole.

This tendency to assimilation was never before so strong as it is now, and it will be found a great help toward forming a uniform international code. The tendency toward a unity of races is another element of immense importance. Germany will hereafter act as a unit. Italy will do likewise. In America no man will hereafter dream of one public law for northern and another for southern States. Even the asperity which always follows a rupture between a colony and the mother country will give way before the influence of race, language, and manners, so far as to allow a large conformity of disposition and purpose, however impossible may be a reunion of governments. The relations between America and England are or were till lately softening under this influence; and if Spain is ever governed by wiser counsels she will

make friends of her ancient colonies instead of continuing to treat them as enemies, and will confer on them benefits rather than wage war against them.

Would it not be a signal honor for this association, rich in illustrious names and distinguished for its beneficent acts, to take the initiative in so noble an undertaking? Would it not be a crowning glory for your country to take it up and carry it on? Wearing the honors of a thousand years, and standing at the head of the civilization of Europe, England would add still more to her renown, and establish a new title to the respect of future ages, if she would perform this crowning act of beneficence.

The young Republic of the West, standing at the head of the civilization of America, vigorous in her youth and far-reaching in her desires, would walk side by side with you and exert herself in equal measures for so grand a consummation. She has been studying during all her existence how to keep great States at peace and make them work for a common object, while she leaves to them all necessary independence for their own peculiar government.

She does this it is true by means of a federated system which she finds best for herself, and which she has cemented by thousands of millions in treasure and hundreds of thousands in precious lives. How far this system may be carried is yet unknown. It may not be possible to extend it to distinct nationalities or to heterogeneous races.

But there is another bond less strict yet capable of binding all nations and all races. This is a uniform system of rules for the guidance of nations and their citizens in their intercourse with each other, framed by the concurring wisdom of each and adopted by the free consent of all. Such an international code, the public law of Christendom, will prove a

gentle but all-constraining bond of nations, self-imposed, and binding them together to abstain from war except in the last extremity, and in peace to help each other, making the weak strong and the strong just, encouraging the intellectual culture, the moral growth, and the industrious pursuits of each, and promoting in all that which is the true end of government, the freedom and happiness of the individual man.

WILLIAM L. GARRISON



WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, an early zealous American Abolitionist, was born at Newburyport, Mass., Dec. 12, 1805, and died at New York, May 24, 1879. Beginning his career as a printer in the "Herald" office of his native town, he also wrote political articles to that and other journals, and in 1820 joined with Benjamin Lundy, a philanthropic Quaker, in editing at Baltimore "The Genius of Universal Emancipation." Here his bold speaking in regard to slavery resulted in his being imprisoned for libel, but after a few months his fine was paid by Mr. Tappan, a New York merchant, and Garrison was set free. In 1831, he issued at Boston the "Liberator," a journal he continued to edit for thirty-five years, until the close of the Civil War. It at once aroused much opposition, and the Georgia legislature in December of that year offered a large sum (\$5,000) to any one who should arrest and prosecute its editor or publisher, according to the laws of Georgia. The New England Anti-Slavery Society was founded in January, 1832, as a result of the "Liberator's" unwearied efforts and influence, and in 1843 Garrison founded the American Anti-Slavery Society, and was its president until 1865. In 1832, he published "Thoughts on African Colonization," in which he characterized the colonization scheme "an ally of slavery." In October, 1835, the "Liberator" office was broken into by a mob and its editor was dragged through the streets with a rope about his neck. His life was saved only by timely police protection. Garrison visited England several times in the interests of the abolition movement, and received a warm welcome from the English anti-slavery leaders. In 1868, his assiduous labors, in the face of much and violent opposition, were rewarded by a gift of \$30,000 from friends of the cause in which he had spent a life of toil and sacrifice. His "Sonnets and Poems" were issued in 1843, and selections from his "Writings and Speeches" in 1852. The "Story of His Life," as told by his children, appeared in 1885.

WORDS OF ENCOURAGEMENT TO THE OPPRESSED

I NEVER rise to address a colored audience without feeling ashamed of my own color; ashamed of being identified with a race of men who have done you so much injustice and who yet retain so large a portion of your brethren in servile chains. To make atonement in part for this conduct I have solemnly dedicated my health and strength and life to your service. I love to plan and to work for your social, intellectual, and spiritual advancement. My happi-

ness is augmented with yours; in your sufferings I participate.

Henceforth I am ready, on all days, on all convenient occasions, in all suitable places, before any sect or party, at whatever peril to my person, character or interest, to plead the cause of my colored countrymen in particular, or of human rights in general. For this purpose, there is no day too holy, no place improper, no body of men too inconsiderable to address. For this purpose I ask no church to grant me authority to speak—I require no ordination—I am not careful to consult Martin Luther, or John Calvin, or His Holiness the Pope. It is a duty which, as a lover of justice, I am bound to discharge; as a lover of my fellow men I ought not to shun; as a lover of Jesus Christ, and of his equalizing, republican and benevolent precepts, I rejoice to perform.

Your condition, as a people, has long attracted my attention, secured my efforts, and awakened in my breast a flame of sympathy which neither the winds nor waves of opposition can ever extinguish. It is the lowness of your estate, in the estimation of the world, which exalts you in my eyes. It is the distance that separates you from the blessings and privileges of society which brings you so closely to my affections. It is the unmerited scorn, reproach, and persecution of your persons by those whose complexion is colored like my own which command for you my sympathy and respect. It is the fewness of your friends—the multitude of your enemies—that induces me to stand forth in your defence.

Countrymen and friends! I wish to gladden your hearts and to invigorate your hopes. Be assured your cause is going onward, right onward. The signs of the times do indeed show forth great and glorious and sudden changes in the condition of the oppressed. The whole firmament is

tremulous with an excess of light; the earth is moved out of its place; the wave of revolution is dashing in pieces ancient and mighty empires; the hearts of tyrants are beginning to fail them for fear, and for looking forward to those things which are to come upon the earth. There is—

"A voice on every wave,
 A sound on every sea!
 The watchword of the brave,
 The anthem of the free!
 Where'er a wind is rushing,
 Where'er a stream is gushing,
 The swelling sounds are heard,
 Of man to freeman calling,
 Of broken fetters falling—
 And, like the carol of a cageless bird,
 The bursting shout of freedom's rallying word!"

Let this be an occasion of joy. Why should it not be so? Is not the heaven over your heads, which has so long been clothed in sackcloth, beginning to disclose its starry principalities and illumine your pathway? Do you not see the pitiless storm which has so long been pouring its rage upon you breaking away, and a bow of promise as glorious as that which succeeded the ancient deluge spanning the sky,—a token that to the end of time the billows of prejudice and oppression shall no more cover the earth to the destruction of your race; but seedtime and harvest shall never fail, and the laborer shall eat the fruit of his hands? Is not your cause developing like the spring? Yours has been a long and rigorous winter. The chill of contempt, the frost of adversity, the blast of persecution, the storm of oppression—all have been yours. There was no substance to be found—no prospect to delight the eye or inspire the drooping heart—no golden ray to dissipate the gloom. The waves of derision were stayed by no barrier, but made a clear breach over you. But now—thanks be to God! that dreary winter is rapidly hastening away. The sun of humanity is going steadily up

from the horizon to its zenith, growing larger and brighter, and melting the frozen earth beneath its powerful rays. The genial showers of repentance are softly falling upon the barren plain; the wilderness is budding like the rose; the voice of joy succeeds the notes of woe; and hope, like the lark, is soaring upwards and warbling hymns at the gate of heaven.

And this is but the outbursting of spring. What, think you, shall be the summer and autumn?

“ Then shall the trembling mourner come,
And bind his sheaves, and bear them home;
The voice, long broke with sighs, shall sing,
And heaven with hallelujahs ring! ”

This is but “ the twilight, the dim dawn ” of day. What, then, shall be the brightness of the day itself? These are but a few drops of mercy. What shall be the full shower, the rolling tide? These are but crumbs of comfort to prevent you wholly from perishing. What shall be the bountiful table?

Why should this not be an occasion of joy instead of sorrow? Listen to those trumpet tones which come swelling on the winds of the Atlantic, and which shall bring an echo from every harp in heaven! If there is joy in that blissful abode over one sinner that repenteth, how mighty and thrilling must it be over a repentant nation! And Great Britain is that nation. Her people are humbling themselves before God, and before those whom they have so long held in bondage. Their voices are breaking in peals of thunder upon the ear of Parliament, demanding the immediate and utter overthrow of slavery in all the colonies; and in obedience to their will the mandate is about being issued by Parliament which shall sever at a blow the chains of eight hundred thousand slaves.

What heart can conceive, what pen or tongue describe, the

happiness which must flow from the consummation of this act? That cruel lash which has torn so many tender bodies and is dripping with innocent blood; that lash which has driven so many human victims, like beasts, to their unrequited toil; that lash whose sounds are heard from the rising of the sun to its decline, mingled with the shrieks of bleeding sufferers; that lash is soon to be cast away, never again to wound the flesh or degrade those who are made in the image of God.

And those fetters of iron which have bound so many in ignominious servitude, and wasted their bodies, and borne them down to an untimely grave, shall be shivered in pieces, as the lightning rends the pine, and the victims of tyranny leap forth, "redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled by the irresistible genius of universal emancipation." And that darkness, which has for so many generations shrouded the minds of the slaves—making them like the brutes that perish—shall give way to the light of freedom and religion. O, how transforming the change! In contemplating it, my imagination overpowers the serenity of my soul and makes language seem poor and despicable.

Cheers for Great Britain! cheers for her noble men and women! cheers for the bright example which they are setting to the world! cheers for their generous sympathy in the cause of the oppressed in our own country!

Why should we not rejoice this evening, brethren? Find we nothing at home to raise our drooping spirits, to invigorate our hopes, and to engage our efforts? Have we made no progress, either in self-improvement, or in the cause of bleeding humanity? Are there no cheering signs of the times, in our moral sky, upon which we may fix our joyful gaze?

Look, in the first place, at the abolition-standard—more

gorgeous and spirit-stirring than the star-spangled banner—floating high in the air! Fresh is the breeze that meets it! bright are the sunny rays which adorn it! Around it thousands are gathering, with high and holy courage, to contend, not with carnal but spiritual weapons, against the powers of darkness. Oh, the loftiness of that spirit which animates them! It towers above the Alps; it pierces beyond the clouds.

Oh, the intensity of that flame of brotherly love which burns within their breasts! It never can burn out—nor can many waters extinguish it.

Oh, the stability of that faith which sustains them under all their toils and trials! It is firmer than the foundations of the earth—it is strong as the throne of God.

Oh, the generous daring of that moral principle which inspires their hearts and governs their actions! Neither reproach nor persecution, neither wealth nor power, neither bolts nor bars, neither the gibbet nor the stake, shall be able to subdue it.

Yes, my colored countrymen, these are the men—ay, and the women, too, who have espoused your cause. And they will stand by it until life be extinct. They will not fail in strength, or faith, or courage, or zeal, or action. Loud as the tempest of oppression may rage around them, above it shall their rallying cry be heard in the thunder-tone of heaven. Dark as their pathway may be, it shall blaze with the light of truth in their possession. Numberless as may be the enemies who surround them, they will not retreat from the field; for he who is mightier than legions of men and devils is the captain of their salvation and will give them the victory.

I know your advocates well—I know the spirit which actuates them. Whether they reside in the east or west or north,

they have but one object—their hearts are stirred with the same pulsation; their eye is single, their motives are pure. Tell me not of the bravery and devotedness of those whose life-blood reddened the plains of Marathon, poured out in defence of liberty. Tell me not of the Spartan band, with Leonidas at their head, who defended the pass of Thermopylæ against a Persian host. I award to them the meed of animal courage; but the heroism of blood and carnage is as much below the patient endurance of wrong and the cheerful forgiveness of injury as the earth is below the sky—it is as often displayed by brute animals as by men.

With infinitely higher satisfaction, with a warmer glow of emulation, with more intense admiration, do I contemplate the Abolition phalanx in the United States who are maintaining your cause unflinchingly through evil report—for the good report is yet to come—and at the imminent peril of their lives; and, what is dearer than life, the sacrifice of their reputation.

If ever there was a cause which established the disinterestedness and integrity of its supporters yours is that cause. They who are contending for the immediate abolition of slavery, the destruction of its ally, the American Colonization Society, and the bestowal of equal rights and privileges upon the whole colored population, well knew what would be the consequences of their advocacy to themselves. They knew that slander would blacken their characters with infamy; that their pleadings would be received with ridicule and reproach; that persecution would assail them on the right hand and on the left; that the dungeon would yawn for their bodies; that the dagger of the assassin would gleam behind them; that the arm of power would be raised to crush them to the earth; that they would be branded as disturbers of the

peace, as fanatics, madmen, and incendiaries; that the heel of friendship would be lifted against them and love be turned into hatred and confidence into suspicion and respect into derision; that their worldly interests would be jeopardized and the honor and emoluments of office would be withheld from their enjoyment.

Knowing all this, still they dare all things in order to save their country by seeking its purification from blood. Will the base and the servile accuse them of being actuated by a hope of reward? Reward! It is the reward which calumny gives to virtue—the reward which selfishness bestows upon benevolence; but nothing of worldly applause or fame or promotion. Yet they have a reward—and who will blame them for coveting it? It is the gratitude of the suffering and the oppressed—the approbation of a good conscience—the blessing of the Most High.

"Tempt them with bribes, you tempt in vain;
Try them with fire, you'll find them true."

To deter such souls from their purposes or vanquish them in combat is as impossible as to stop the rush of the ocean when the spirit of the storm rides upon its mountain billows. They are hourly increasing in number and strength and going on from conquering to conquer. Convert after convert, press after press, pulpit after pulpit, is subdued and enlisted on the side of justice and freedom.

A grave charge is brought against me, that I am exciting your rage against the whites and filling your minds with revengeful feelings. Is this true? Have not all my addresses and appeals to you had just the contrary effect upon your minds? Have they not been calculated to make you bear all your trials and difficulties in the spirit of Christian resignation and to induce you to return good for evil? Where

is the calumniator who dares to affirm that you have been turbulent and quarrelsome since I began my labors in your behalf? Where is the man who is so ignorant as not to know or perceive that, as a people, you are constantly improving in knowledge and virtue? No, brethren; you will bear me a unanimous testimony that I have not implanted in your minds any malice toward your persecutors but on the contrary forgiveness of injuries. And I can as truly aver that in all my intercourse with you as a people I have not seen or heard anything of a malignant or revengeful spirit. No, yours has been eminently a spirit of resignation and faith under the most aggravating circumstances.

I will notice but one other charge which the enemies of our cause have brought against me. It is that I am unduly exciting your hopes and holding out to your view prospects of future happiness and respectability which can never be realized in this country. Pitiful complaint! Because I have planted a solitary rose, as it were, in the wilderness of suffering in which your race has so long wandered, to cheer your drooping hearts, I am sharply reprov'd for giving even this little token of good things to come—by those too who make loud professions of friendship for you, that is if you will go to Liberia, but who are constantly strewing in your path briars and thorns and digging pits into which you may stumble to rise no more. These querulous complainants who begrudge every drop of comfort which falls upon your thirsty lips as a miser mourns the loss of a penny seem to forget or discard the promise of Jehovah, that “the wilderness shall bud and blossom like the rose.” I have faith to believe that this promise will ultimately be fulfilled even in this land of republicanism and Christianity. Surely I may

be pardoned when so many are endeavoring to break down all your rising hopes and noble aspirations if I urge you not to despair, for the day of redemption will assuredly come. Nay, I may still be forgiven if I transcend the limits of probability and suffer my imagination to paint in too glowing colors the recompense which is to be yours; since, strive as I may, I can scarcely hope to equalize the heart-crushing discouragements and assaults made by your enemies.

All things considered, you have certainly done well as a body. There are many colored men whom I am proud to rank among my friends; whose native vigor of mind is remarkable; whose morals are unexceptionable; whose homes are the abode of contentment, plenty, and refinement. For my own part, when I reflect upon the peculiarities of your situation; what indignities have been heaped upon your heads; in what utter dislike you are generally held even by those who profess to be the ministers and disciples of Christ; and how difficult has been your chance to arrive at respectability and affluence, I marvel greatly, not that you are no more enlightened and virtuous, but that you are not like wild beasts of the forests. I fully coincide with the sentiment of Mr. Jefferson, that the men must be prodigies who can retain their manners and morals under such circumstances. Surely you have a right to demand an equal position among mankind.

Oh, if those whose prejudices against color are deeply rooted—if the asserters of the natural inferiority of the people of color would but even casually associate with the victims of their injustice and be candid enough to give merit its due, they could not long feel and act as they now do. Their prejudices would melt like frost-work before the blazing sun; their unbelief would vanish away, their con-

tempt be turned into admiration, their indifference be roused to benevolent activity, and their dislike give place to friendship. Keeping aloof from your society, ignorant of the progress which you are making in virtue, knowledge, and competence, and believing all the aspersions of malice which are cast upon your character, they at length persuade themselves that you are utterly worthless and nearly akin to the brute creation. Cruel men! cruel women! thus hastily and blindly to pass condemnation upon those who deserve your compassion and are worthy of your respect!

Be this your encouragement in view of our separation. Although absent from you in body I shall still be with you in spirit. I go away, not to escape from toil, but to labor more abundantly in your cause. If I may do something for your good at home I hope to do more abroad. In the meantime, I beseech you fail not, on your part, to lead quiet and orderly lives. Let there be no ground whatever for the charge which is brought against you by your enemies, that you are turbulent and rude. Let all quarrelling, all dram-drinking, all profanity, all violence, all division, be confined to the white people. Imitate them in nothing but what is clearly good and carefully shun even the appearance of evil. Let them, if they will, follow the devices and perform the drudgery of the devil; but be ye perfect, even as your heavenly Father is perfect. Conquer their aversion by moral excellence; their proud spirit by love; their evil acts by acts of goodness; their animosity by forgiveness. Keep in your hearts the fear of God and rejoice even in tribulation; for the promise is sure that all things shall work together for good to those who love his name.

As for myself, whatever may be my fate—whether I fall in the springtime of manhood by the hand of the assassin, or

be immured in a Georgia cell, or be permitted to live to a ripe old age—I know that the success of your cause is not dependent upon my existence. I am but as a drop in the ocean, which if it be separated cannot be missed.

My own faith is strong—my vision clear—my consolation great. “Who art thou, O great mountain? Before Zerubabel thou shalt become a plain; and he shall bring forth the headstone thereof with shoutings, crying, Grace, grace unto it.” Let us confidently hope that the day is at hand when we shall be enabled to celebrate not merely the abolition of the slave trade by law but in fact, and the liberation of every descendant of Africa, wherever one exists in bondage under the whole heavens.

JOHN PARKER HALE



JOHN PARKER HALE, American statesman, was born at Rochester, N. H., March 31, 1806, and died at Dover, N. H., Nov. 19, 1873. He was educated at Dartmouth College, and after studying law was admitted to the Bar in 1830. He entered the legislature of his native State in 1832, and from 1834 to 1841 was United States district attorney for New Hampshire, and a Democratic representative in Congress from 1843 to 1845. He was nominated for reelection, but having announced that he should not vote for the annexation of Texas, his name was dropped. A coalition of Whigs and Independent Democrats subsequently made him speaker of the House, and in 1847 he was chosen senator. He was an earnest opponent of slavery extension, and for that reason became, in 1852, the presidential candidate of the Free-Soil party. Leaving the Senate in 1853, he returned to it in 1855, and was as conspicuous as formerly in his opposition to the Slave power, a theme which always absorbed him. He possessed a pleasing voice and agreeable manners, and his speeches exhibited both wit and pathos. He continued in the Senate until 1865, when he received the appointment of Minister to Spain. He was recalled in 1869, and died in his sixty-eighth year.

SPEECH ON SECESSION

DELIVERED IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE, DECEMBER 5, 1860

MR. PRESIDENT,—I was very much in hopes, when the message was presented, that it would be a document which would commend itself cordially to somebody. I was not so sanguine about its pleasing myself, but I was in hopes that it would be one thing or another. I was in hopes that the President would have looked in the face the crisis in which he says the country is, and that his message would be either one thing or another. But, sir, I have read it somewhat carefully. I listened to it as it was read at the desk, and if I understand it, and I think I do, it is this: South Carolina has just cause for seceding from the Union; that is the first proposition. The second is that she has no right to secede. The third is that we have no right to prevent her

(262)

from seceding. That is the President's message, substantially. He goes on to represent this as a great and powerful country, and that no State has a right to secede from it; but the power of the country, if I understand the President, consists in what Dickens makes the English constitution to be—a power to do nothing at all.

Now, sir, I think it was incumbent upon the President of the United States to point out definitely and recommend to Congress some rule of action, and to tell us what he recommended us to do. But, in my judgment, he has entirely avoided it. He has failed to look the thing in the face. He has acted like the ostrich, which hides her head and thereby thinks to escape danger.

Sir, the only way to escape danger is to look it in the face. I think the country did expect from the President some exposition of a decided policy, and I confess that, for one, I was rather indifferent as to what that policy was that he recommended, but I hoped that it would be something; that it would be decisive. He has utterly failed in that respect.

I think we may as well look this matter right clearly in the face, and I am not going to be long about doing it. I think that this state of affairs looks to one of two things; it looks to absolute submission, not on the part of our Southern friends and the southern States, but of the North, to the abandonment of their position,—it looks to a surrender of that popular sentiment which has been uttered through the constituted forms of the ballot-box, or it looks to open war.

We need not shut our eyes to the fact. It means war, and it means nothing else; and the State which has put herself in the attitude of secession so looks upon it. She has asked no council, she has considered it as a settled question, and she has armed herself. As I understand the aspect of affairs, it looks

to that, and it looks to nothing else except unconditional submission on the part of the majority.

I did not read the paper—I do not read many papers—but I understand that there was a remedy suggested in a paper printed, I think in this city, and it was that the President and the Vice-President should be inaugurated (that would be a great concession!) and then, being inaugurated, they should quietly resign! Well, sir, I am not entirely certain that that would settle the question. I think that after the President and Vice-President-elect had resigned there would be as much difficulty in settling who was to take their places as there was in settling it before.

I do not wish, sir, to say a word that shall increase any irritation, that shall add any feeling of bitterness to the state of things which really exists in the country, and I would bear and forbear before I would say anything which would add to this bitterness. But I tell you, sir, the plain, true way is to look this thing in the face—see where we are. And I avow here—I do not know whether or not I shall be sustained by those who usually act with me—if the issue which is presented is that the constitutional will of the public opinion of this country, expressed through the forms of the constitution, will not be submitted to, and war is the alternative, let it come in any form or in any shape.

The Union is dissolved and it cannot be held together as a Union if that is the alternative upon which we go into an election. If it is pre-announced and determined that the voice of the majority, expressed through the regular and constituted forms of the constitution, will not be submitted to, then, sir, this is not a Union of equals; it is a Union of a dictatorial oligarchy on one side and a herd of slaves and cowards on the other. That is it, sir, nothing more, nothing less.

If this discussion is proceeded with I shall take occasion, by the indulgence of the Senate, once more to address myself to that phase of this controversy which is so constantly, so perseveringly, so continuously held up—that the northern States of the Union are the aggressors in producing this unhappy state of things. The northern States of the Union are the aggressors in one sense; we have a set of presses and a set of politicians among us traitorous to the public voice and the public interests, ministering to a diseased appetite, that lend their energies to the dissemination of aspersions and slanders upon the people among whom they live and upon whom they feed, and I very much fear that our friends upon the other side have listened too much to their aspersions of their fellow citizens, rather than to their own convictions of what the truth is.

I desire, if this discussion proceeds, to show up what I conceive to be the true character of this position of things so far as relates to the alleged aggressions of the northern States, but I do not pretend to speak for the northern States; I have no right to do so; they did not send me here; I was not elected by the northern States; I am only here to speak for one, and let me say, sir, that I have no fear, not the slightest, no doubt, not the minutest, let the result of this unhappy controversy be what it may; let it be settled in any form it may; drenched in blood, if it may—I have no fear—no doubt, that that little State which I have the honor in part to represent on this floor, will stand acquit—not before posterity; I do not care so much about that—but will stand acquit before the tribunal of the civilized world; will stand acquit before the verdict of Christendom of to-day; will stand acquit before the impartial and independent judgment of the men of to-day.

I have no such distrust of the position that State occupies,

that I wish to appeal from the present to the future. No, sir. I say that the State which I have the honor in part to represent here, upon the constitution, upon the record, and upon the truth of history, will stand to-day and forever fully acquitted of every charge that can be brought against her of looking to the infraction, on her part, of the constitution or any of its provisions, be they onerous or otherwise.

Let me say further, sir, that if there are gentlemen who look to the settlement of this controversy by further concessions from the North, I think they miscalculate and mistake. I believe the difficulty has been that we have conceded too much; we have compromised too much, and we have got to that position of things that whenever any fault is found the ever-recurring remedy to the minds of patriots and statesmen is still further concessions from the North.

I agree—I have said it here, I have said it to my own people at home, I am willing to repeat it here—I agree that under the constitution of the United States you are entitled to demand and to have an honest and a fair discharge of that obligation which is imposed on all the States in regard to the rendition of fugitive slaves, and I am willing, perfectly willing, that there shall be an honest, fair, and faithful performance of that pledge.

I listened to the senator from North Carolina yesterday and I agree in very much that he said—more in what he said as general truths than in the particular application that he wished to make; but I can tell that honorable senator if he will sum up every case of injury, of suffering, of aggression by the whole of the free States upon the right that they have to recapture fugitive slaves and put it all down in its darkest colors; draw the image as hideous as truth and fancy can make it; when the sum is all told I can show him aggres-

sions upon the rights of citizens of the free States—upon the constitutional right which is conferred on the citizens of each State in every State—I can show cases of aggression against that right that will infinitely outweigh and outnumber everything that can be brought in the way of aggression by the free States upon the rights of the South in regard to the recapture of their slaves.

Sir, we are trying an experiment. I believe we are in its crisis. I have never been of that number who have been disposed to sympathize with 4th of July orators, who have been in the habit, for the last half or three quarters of a century, of glorifying this country and telling what great things she had done. I have uniformly said, when I have had occasion to address the public on the subject, “We have done nothing; we are but at the beginning of a great experiment.”

We talk of our republic! Why, sir, it has not yet outlived the ages of the soldiers who fought its battles and won its victories; but yet we are boasting of our victory. Sir, I think Rome existed as a republic for six hundred years, and they might well boast of something that they had done; but that republic passed away. We have not yet survived the lifetime of the men who fought the battles of liberty, or of the patriots and sages who formed our constitution of government. What we have obtained we have obtained by a great effort and a great price. It was not the mere price of the American Revolution; it was not the mere price of the patriot blood that was shed, or of the patriot counsels that formed the constitution; but away back, centuries upon centuries in English history, where power and principle contended against each other with alternate success and defeat—in all those centuries there had been going on the contest which is culminating in our experiment here; and no patriot

blood that was poured out on the battle fields in the civil wars of England has been insignificant in relation to this conflict.

Now, sir, I have said nearly all that I propose to say, unless I am provoked by and by to say more, which I hope I shall not be; but, sir, I will add this: we shall present a most humiliating spectacle to the world if at this time, when by the acknowledgment of the President of the United States the blessings of heaven have descended upon this people in all the channels of their efforts and their business to an unexampled degree; when the bounties of heaven have been showered down upon us with no niggard hand; at a time, too, when by the confession of a senator from Georgia, not now in his seat [Mr. Toombs], made last year on the floor of the senate—I cannot quote his very words, but I can his sentiment—this general government was faithfully performing all its functions in relation to the slave States, and in relation to every State, never more faithfully than at the present time; I say, if under such circumstances, with a faithful government, and, I will add, a subservient judiciary, with the blessings of Providence coming down upon us as they are, if at such a time this confederacy should burst, this glorious fraternity of States be dissevered, and we try by the doubtful contingencies of separate State action to carry out the great experiment of human liberty, we shall present a most humiliating spectacle.

Why, sir, the very day, the very hour, that we are coming to such a result and thus developing our experiment, the States of Italy that for centuries have gone through the baptism of fire and blood, groaning beneath the iron heel of despotism, one under this and another under that, are throwing off the yoke and uniting together—I say that at such a time when the classic States of Italy, taught by the bitter ex-

perience of centuries, are seeking by a consolidated constitutional government to come together and unite their energies for liberty, for independence, and for progress, if we, untaught by all the past, reckless of the present and blind to the future, should madly dash ourselves upon this dark ocean whose shores no eye of prophecy or of faith can discern, we shall present a sad spectacle to the world.

Sir, I do not know what is to be the future; but I do hope that if we cannot settle this difficulty in the spirit in which it ought to be settled, we shall at least have the courage and the manhood to look it straight in the face and understand what it is.

I know nothing, sir, about the policy of the incoming administration. I have never passed a word by mouth or by letter with the President-elect since he has been nominated for the high office to which the people have elected him. It has been my fortune since I have had a seat upon this floor to find myself uniformly, constantly, and perseveringly in the opposition to the administration. I am far from certain that I have not got to take the same position in regard to the incoming administration—very far. One thing is certain; if that administration shall quail in the performance of its duty, if its head shall hesitate, as Mr. Buchanan has done, to look the thing clearly in the face and mark out a policy consistent with honor and patriotism, he certainly will not find me among the number of his supporters.

GARIBALDI



IUSEPPE MARIA GARIBALDI, a famous Italian soldier and patriot, was born at Nice, July 4, 1807, and died on the island of Caprera, just north of Sardinia, June 1, 1882. He was a sailor in his early years, and in 1833-34 took part in the Young Italy movement which led to his exile. For a while he served in the French navy, and then proceeding to South America in 1836 he offered his services to the struggling republic of Rio Grande. He fought in many battles in her cause, and for his conspicuous bravery at the battle of San Antonio in 1846 he was dubbed "The Hero of Montevideo." In 1848, he returned to Italy and in 1849 fought in the defence of Rome against French intervention. After the fall of Rome, he, with his followers, sought refuge in San Marino, but being surrounded by the Austrian troops he was compelled to disband his forces, and escaping to Chiavari, in Liguria, was offered exile or captivity by the Sardinian government. Accepting exile he sailed to Tunis, but was prevented from landing through French influence. After a visit to the United States, he returned to Italy in 1854 and purchased part of the small island of Caprera, near the Sardinian coast. Here he lived till 1859, when he took a prominent part in the Lombard campaign, and after the peace of Villafranca he formed the design of liberating Rome. In the attempted execution of this design he was frustrated by the Sardinian government; but in his expedition in 1860 against Sicily, he was aided by Cavour. After the battle of Reggio and the flight of Francis II of Naples to Gaeta, Garibaldi was proclaimed at Naples dictator of the Two Sicilies. In 1862, 1866, and 1867, he engaged in other expeditions for the liberation of Italy, and in the last-named year was for some time a prisoner in the fortress of Varignano. With his sons, he went in 1870 to the aid of the French Republic against the Germans. In 1875, he became a member of the Italian Parliament, his legislative career being marked by his radicalism and uncompromising republicanism. His later years were spent at his island home of Caprera.

LAST SPEECH AS A MEMBER OF THE CHAMBER

DELIVERED IN PARLIAMENT, APRIL 12, 1860

GENTLEMEN,—The fifth article of the constitution says: Such treaties as involve any variation in the territory of the State shall have no effect until after the assent of the Chambers shall have been obtained. The consequence of this article of the fundamental law is that any

(270)

attempt to put into execution a diminution of the state, before such diminution shall have had the sanction of Parliament, is contrary to the constitution. That one section of the state should vote for a separation before the Chambers should have decided that such a separation ought to take place, before they should have decided whether or how there should be any voting at all for the bare principle of putting into execution that very separation—is an unconstitutional act.

This, gentlemen, is the question of Nice, as regarded from a constitutional point of view, and which I submit to the sagacious judgment of Parliament. Now I will speak a few words upon the question of my country considered politically.

The people of Nice after the submission of 1388 to the house of Savoy, established on the 19th of November, 1391, that the Count of Savoy could never alienate the city in favor of any other prince whatsoever, and that if he should do so the inhabitants should have the right to resist *vi et armis* and to choose for themselves another sovereign according to their own pleasure, without rendering themselves guilty of rebellion. Therefore in the year 1388 Nice united herself to the dynasty of Savoy upon condition of not being alienated to any foreign power. Now the government, by its treaty of March 24th, has ceded Nice to Napoleon. Such a concession is contrary to the rights of nations. It will be said that Nice has been exchanged for two more important provinces. Nevertheless every traffic in people is repugnant to the universal sense of civilized nations and ought to be abolished, because it establishes a dangerous precedent, which might easily diminish that faith that a country has a just right to place in its own future.

The government justifies its proceeding by the popular vote

which is to take place on the 15th and 16th of the current month.

In Savoy this has been appointed for the 22d, but there is more of a hurry about Nice. The pressure under which the people of Nice finds itself crushed, the presence of numerous police officials, the limitless flatteries and threats exercised upon those poor people, the stress which the government is employing to help on the union to France—as results from the proclamation of the governor, Labonis—the absence from Nice of very many of our citizens, fairly compelled by such means to leave the city, the precipitation and constrained manner in which the vote of the population is demanded—all these circumstances take from what should be universal suffrage its true characteristic of liberty.

I and my colleagues are confident that the Chamber and the ministry will be disposed to provide immediately and energetically to the end that this supreme vote of my native country may be free from every pressure, and pronounced with that surety and legal regularity with which the Chamber will desire to safeguard, demanding in the meantime the suspension of any vote at Nice.

[Special translation.]

SPEECH TO HIS SOLDIERS

[Delivered in the royal palace at Naples, on the occasion of the presentation of the returns of the popular vote to Victor Emmanuel, November 9, 1860.]

MY COMPANIONS IN ARMS,—At this, the penultimate break in our march of resurrection, it is our duty to reflect upon the period which is just coming to an end and then to prepare ourselves to terminate splendidly the admirable work performed by the elect of

twenty generations; the entire accomplishment of which has been assigned by Providence to our fortunate generation.

Yes, young men, Italy owes to you the enterprise which merits the plaudits of all the world.

You have conquered, and you will continue to conquer, because you are from now to henceforth trained to those tactics which decide the fate of battles. You have in no wise degenerated from the virtues of those who penetrated to the profoundest centre of the Macedonian phalanxes and humbled the proud victor of Asia.

To this astonishing page of our country's history there will succeed one yet more marvellous, when the slave shall at last show to his free brother the sharpened steel which he has drawn and forged from the links of his own chain.

To arms, then, all, all! And the oppressors and tyrants shall vanish away like the dust of the streets.

May women repel far from them all cowards. Daughters of a land of battles, they can only desire heroic and generous descendants. Let the timid and the doctrinaires depart, to trail along elsewhere their servility and their shame.

The Italian people is now its own master. It would indeed be as a brother to the other peoples, but holding ever its forehead high; and it would neither crawl along begging for its liberty, nor suffer itself to be towed on by anybody. No, no; a hundred times, no!

Providence has bestowed on Italy the gift of Victor Emmanuel. All men should attach themselves to him and gather round him. Before the *Re Galant'uomo* all rivalry should cease, every rancor disappear. So once more I repeat my cry, "To arms, to arms, all!"

If the month of March, 1861, does not find a million Italians on foot—alas for poor liberty, for the poor Italian existence!

But far be from me such a thought, which is as deadly for me as poison! But surely next March—and even if need be next February—will find each man at his post.

Italians of Catalfini, Palermo, the Volturno, Ancona, Castelfidardo, and Iservica; and with us every inhabitant of this land, who is not cowardly or senile, crowd around the glorious soldier of Palestro, and we will bring the last shock, will deal the last blow against the crumbling and tottering dynasty.

Receive now, young volunteers, ye who in honor remain of those who won ten battles, my farewell words. I address them to you from my deepest soul. I must withdraw from you to-day, but only for a few days. The hour of battle will find me beside you—beside you, the warriors of Italian liberty.

Let such only return to their homes as imperious domestic duties demand, and those who, having been gloriously wounded, have a right to the gratitude of the common fatherland. They can still serve her at their own firesides by their advice and by the display of the noble scars which adorn their brows of twenty years. With these exceptions let all remain under the glorious banners!

We shall soon meet again to march together to the rescue of those brothers who are still enslaved. We shall soon find ourselves again united to march on together unto new triumphs! [And to those who stood nearest him.] *A rivederci sulla via di Roma.*—To our meeting again, then, on the road to Rome!

[Special translation.]

CHARLES F. ADAMS



HARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, a distinguished American statesman, diplomatist, and writer, the son of John Quincy Adams, sixth President of the United States, was born at Boston, Mass., Aug. 18, 1807, and died there Nov. 21, 1886. When but a child he was taken by his father to St. Petersburg, where, during his father's diplomatic mission, he learned French, German, and Russian. In 1817, he returned to America and in due course entered Harvard University, studied law, and in 1828 was admitted to the Suffolk Bar. He sat in the Massachusetts House of Representatives as a Whig member (1831-36), but afterwards adopted the views of the Free-Soil party and was its candidate for Vice-president in 1848. From 1859 to 1861 he represented his native State in Congress; and from 1861 to 1868 was Minister to England, rendering high service to his country in his diplomatic capacity during a critical period, and in 1871-72 served on the Geneva Board of Arbitration. Mr. Adams was a man of much firmness of character, but he was never popular, on account of the cold, unsympathetic manner he had inherited from his father. He wrote a "Life of John Adams," and edited the "Diary of John Quincy Adams."

ON THE STATES AND THE UNION

FROM SPEECH DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
JANUARY 32, 1861

MR. SPEAKER,—In this hour of inexpressible import to the fate of unborn millions I would that I could clear from my eyes the film of all human passions, to see the truth and the right in their naked, living reality, and with their aid to rise to the grandeur of the opportunity to do good to my fellow men. There have been occasions when the fitting words uttered in the true place have helped to right the scale when wavering towards the ruin of a nation. At no time have they been more necessary than now. At no place more requisite than here.

The most magnificent example of self-government known to history is in imminent danger of suffering an abrupt muti-

lation by reason of the precipitate violence of a few desperate men. I purpose to discuss briefly and I trust with proper calmness the cause and the effect of this proceeding as well as the duty that it entails upon us.

On the 6th of November the people of the United States were called for the nineteenth time to give in their votes for the election of the highest officers known to the constitution. Nothing marked the proceeding with any unusual features. No reluctance had been manifested in any quarter to fulfil the duty, the proof of which is that no more full expression of opinion was ever made.

No complaint of unfairness or fraud was heard. No contested question sprang up. With the single exception of the State of Virginia not a doubt was entertained of the true reflection of the popular sense in designating the electors whose province it is to complete the process. Not a soul has been bold enough to deny the fact, that, from the origin of the government, not a single election which had been disputed at all was ever more fairly conducted or more unequivocally determined.

The sublime spectacle viewed thus far by foreign nations with a degree of amazement, proportioned to the ever-expanding nature of the operation of so many millions of people spread over so many thousands of miles of a continent stretching from sea to sea, peacefully in a single day selecting their chief rulers for the next four years was once more presented to all outward appearance, as successfully executed as in any preceding and more contracted stage of the republic.

Yet, no sooner was the result positively ascertained than the people of one of the States, even whilst engaged in performing the common duty as faithfully as all the rest and without the intervention of a single new disturbing cause,

suddenly broke out into violent remonstrance and dashed into immediate efforts to annul all their obligations to the constitution. Such a step had never before been taken in any quarter. The same spirit directly manifested itself in the region round about, and it has continued ever since to spread until it has more or less affected the loyalty of ten or twelve of the States. At the precise period of this occurrence no new provocation had been given, unless it were to be found in the single fact that the successful candidates were persons for whom those States had not voted.

A similar instance had never occurred. There have been several cases of popular resistance to federal laws. South Carolina had herself furnished a memorable one. But here was an example of resistance to a constitutional election of men. The former may be conducted without necessarily shaking the very foundations of the social system. But the latter at once denies the validity of the only process by which the organic law can be executed at all. To refuse to acknowledge the constituted authorities of a nation when successfully carried out is revolution; and it is called rebellion when it fails under every code of laws known over the globe.

It is an appeal to physical force, which depends for its justification before God and man only upon the clear establishment of proof of intolerable tyranny and oppression. It is sometimes the last resource of patriots who feel themselves impelled to overthrow a despotism, but oftener the contrivance of desperate adventurers, who seek for their own private ends to establish one.

Had the present outbreak seemed to me the consequence of mature deliberation and deep-settled convictions among the people, I should at once have despaired of the republic. But apart from the merely outward indications of haste and

of passion that attended it I had other reasons for believing differently. During the previous summer the representative candidate of the most extreme party in the slaveholding States had labored more than once to declare himself a devoted friend of the Union. Whilst on the other hand the distrust in him inspired by the character of his principal advocates, had had the effect of alienating from him numbers even in his own State, who preferred the security offered to them by the friends of another candidate brought forward exclusively as the upholder of "the Union, the constitution, and the enforcement of the laws."

The slaveholding States were thus divided between these two influences, neither of them venturing before the people to whisper the theory of disunion. A very large minority of the aggregated voters sustained the most thoroughly pledged candidate whilst Tennessee and Kentucky gave him their electoral votes and even the Old Dominion, never known before to waver in the course marked out by her acknowledged and ancient leaders, was seen to transfer her votes to the more loyal side.

All these events were not the natural forerunners of premeditated disaffection to the constitutional government. They can only be accounted for by presuming a fund of honest attachment to it at bottom. And the inference which I draw is, that the feelings of a majority of well-disposed persons have been suddenly carried away by sympathy with their warmer and more violent friends in South Carolina, so that they have not stopped calmly to weigh the probable consequences of their own precipitation.

If I were to need more evidence to prove to me the absence of deliberate intent, outside of South Carolina, to set aside an election regularly made, I think I could find it in

the earnestness with which other causes have been set up in justification of resistance. It has been alleged that various grievances have been suffered, much oppression has been endured, and certain outrages have been committed upon the people of the slaveholding States, which render their longer stay in the Union impossible, unless confidence can be inspired that some remedies may be applied to stop the evils for the future. They aver that their rights are no longer secure in remaining with us, and that the alternative left is to withdraw themselves before acquiescence shall have prepared them for ultimate subjugation. They come to us and demand that these complaints shall be listened to and these apprehensions allayed before they can consent to farther abide under the authority of a common head.

And here some of my friends on the right reply, with equal warmth and not less reason, that they are unconscious of having done wrong in electing a President according to the constitution; that they are not aware of any real grievances that demand redress; and that they feel disinclined to enter upon any experiment to quiet apprehensions which are in their opinion either artificial or imaginary; that they appeal to the constitution as it is—and if obedience to its requisitions be not voluntarily rendered in any quarter the only proper remedy is coercion.

I should perhaps be disposed to concur in this view were this a case of deliberate and wilful conspiracy to subvert the government. I am not sure that I would not apply the doctrine to the people of South Carolina, who have long been known to be generally disaffected. They neither demand nor expect any redress, or even a consideration of their grievances. They declare themselves only to be executing a treasonable project that they have been meditating for twenty

years. They have therefore put themselves without the pale of negotiation. There is not even a minority of the citizens who remonstrate. The case is otherwise with the other States. There is evident hesitation and reluctance in adopting the irrevocable policy of disunion. There is a lingering desire to receive assurances that this step is not absolutely needed. Now I, for one, am not ready yet to take the responsibility of absolutely closing the door to reconciliation.

I cannot permit myself to forget the warnings that have descended to us from many of the wisest and best statesmen and patriots of all time, against this rigid and haughty mode of treating great discontents. I cannot overlook the fact that in the days of our fathers the imperious spirit of Chatham did not feel itself as sacrificing any of his proud dignity by proposing to listen to their grievances, and even to concede to every reasonable demand, long after they had placed themselves in armed resistance to all the power of Great Britain.

Had George III listened to his words of wisdom he might have saved the brightest jewel of his crown. He took the opposite course. He denied the existence of grievances. He rejected the olive branch. He insisted upon coercion. And what was the result? History records its verdict in favor of Chatham and against his king. And who is there in the mother country at this day who does not regret the blunder, if he does not condemn the motive of the monarch? When the great grandson of that same king, on his late visit to this capital, so handsomely made his pilgrimage to the tomb of the arch-rebel of that time, do you imagine that his countrymen and future subjects would have applauded the act if they still believed that the stiff-backed old king had been right in shutting the door of reconciliation?

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I am more inclined to accord with that philosophical statesman, Edmund Burke, who during the same struggle was not afraid to bring forward his plan of conciliation with America. And in the elaborate speech which he made in its defence he used the following language—not entirely inappropriate to these times :

“ Now, in such unfortunate quarrels among the component parts of a great political union of communities, I can scarcely conceive anything more completely improvident than for the head of the empire to insist that, if any privilege is pleaded against his will or his acts, his whole authority is denied, instantly to proclaim rebellion, to beat to arms, and to put the offending provinces under the ban. Will not this, sir, very soon teach the provinces to make no distinctions on their part? Will it not teach them that the government, against which a claim of liberty is tantamount to high treason, is a government in which submission is equivalent to slavery? ”

Mr. Speaker, it is not my custom to lean much upon authority. As a general thing it appears to me to pass for more than it is worth. But there are persons who are always more or less influenced by the source from which anything comes, and who are better disposed to believe in the testimony of a witness two centuries old than if the same reasoning were issued from the lips of the best of living contemporaries. To such I will commend a passage drawn from the most profound of British statesmen and philosophers, Francis Bacon :

“ Concerning the materials of seditions it is a thing well to be considered; for the surest way to prevent seditions (if the times do bear it) is to take away the matter of them; for if there be fuel prepared it is hard to tell whence the spark shall come that shall set it on fire. . . .

“ As for discontentments, they are in the politic body, like to humors in the natural, which are apt to gather a preter-

natural heat and to inflame; and let no prince measure the danger of them by this, whether they be just or unjust; for that were to imagine people to be too reasonable, who do often spurn at their own good; nor yet by this, whether the griefs whereupon they rise be, in fact, great or small; for they are the most dangerous discontentments where the fear is greater than the feeling. *Dolendi modus, timendi non item*; besides, in great oppressions the same things that provoke the patience, do withal mete the courage; but, in fears, it is not so. Neither let any prince or state be secure concerning discontentments, because they have been often, or have been long, and yet no peril hath ensued; for, as it is true, that every vapor or fume doth not turn into a storm, so it is nevertheless true, that storms, though they blow over divers times, yet may fall at last; and, as the Spanish proverb noteth well, 'The cord breaketh at last by the weakest pull.' "

Such deep sagacity as this convinces me, if I ever doubted, that the way to peace in times of disorder is not always found by refusing to listen to complaints. I differ, then, with some of my rigid friends on this point. I prefer to consider grievances, were it but to be sure that they have no just foundation; much more if they prove to merit attention for their reasonableness. My notion of the duty of a public man is to watch the growth of offences and not to neglect, still less to despise them. I have therefore faithfully labored in my humble way to comprehend the nature of the discontents actually prevailing and to judge of the extent to which they justify the resort to so violent a mode of relief as the overthrow of a government. After a full hearing of all that has been said in committee and elsewhere I easily embrace the topics of complaint under three heads, to wit:

1. The passage of laws in some of the free States operating to discourage the recovery of fugitive slaves.
2. The denial of equal rights in the Territories

3. The apprehension of such an increase of political power in the free States as to tempt an invasion, under new forms of the constitution, of the right of the slave States to manage their domestic affairs.

After a full and calm examination of the grounds furnished to sustain these complaints I am ready to declare that if these are all that endanger the continuance of the present common bond of association between the States, in my opinion no similar sacrifice to mere abstractions was ever before made among reasoning men. . . .

For if the sentiment of disunion become so far universal and permanent in the dissatisfied States as to show no prospect of good from resistance, and there be no acts of aggression attempted on their part, I will not say that I may not favor the idea of some arrangement of a peaceful character, though I do not now see the authority under which it can be originated. The new confederacy can scarcely be other than a secondary power. It can never be a maritime State. It will begin with the necessity of keeping eight millions of its population to watch four millions and with the duty of guarding against the egress of the latter, several thousand miles of an exposed border, beyond which there will be no right of reclamation. Of the ultimate result of a similar experiment, I cannot in my own mind have a moment's doubt. At the last session I ventured to place on record in this House a prediction by which I must abide, let the effect of the future on my sagacity be what it may. I have not yet seen any reason to doubt its accuracy. I now repeat it. The experiment will ignominiously fail.

But there are exceptions to the adoption of this peaceful policy which it will not be wise to overlook. If there be violent and wanton attacks upon the persons or the property

of the citizens of the United States or of their government, I see not how demands for immediate redress can be avoided. If any interruptions should be attempted of the regular channels of trade on the great watercourses or on the ocean, they cannot long be permitted. And if any considerable minorities of citizens should be persecuted or proscribed on account of their attachment to the Union and should call for protection, I cannot deny the obligation of this government to afford it. There are persons in many of the States whose patriotic declarations and honorable pledges of support of the Union may bring down upon them more than the ill will of their infatuated fellow citizens.

It would be impossible for the people of the United States to look upon any proscription of them with indifference. These are times which should bring together all men by whatever party name they may have been heretofore distinguished upon common ground. When I heard the gentlemen from Virginia the other day so bravely and so forcibly urging their manly arguments in support of the Union, the constitution, and the enforcement of the laws, my heart involuntarily bounded towards them as brethren sacredly engaged in a common cause. Let them, said I to myself, accept the offered settlement of the differences that remain between us on some fair basis like that proposed by the committee, and then what is to prevent us all who yet believe that the Union must be preserved from joining heart and hand our common forces to effect it?

When the cry goes out that the ship is in danger of sinking the first duty of every man on board, no matter what his particular vocation, is to lend all the strength he has to the work of keeping her afloat. What! shall it be said that we waver in the view of those who begin by trying to expunge


the sacred memory of the Fourth of July? Shall we help them to obliterate the associations that cluster around the glorious struggle for independence or sanctify the labors of the patriots who erected this magnificent political edifice upon the adamantine base of human liberty? Shall we surrender the fame of Washington and Laurens, of Gadsden and the Lees, of Jefferson and Madison, and of the myriads of heroes whose names are imperishably connected with the memory of a united people? Never, never.

For myself I can only interpose against what seems to me like the madness of the moon, the barrier of a single feeble remonstrance. But in any event it shall never be said of my share in the action of this hour of danger, that it has been guided by vindictive passions or narrow considerations of personal or party advantage. I well know what I hazard among many whose good opinion has ever been part of the sunlight of my existence, in following what I held to be a higher duty. Whilst at any and at all times I shall labor to uphold the great principles of liberty, without which this grand system of our fathers would seem to be a mockery and a show, I shall equally strive to give no just ground to enemies and traitors to expand the circle of mischief they may do.

Although not very frequently indulging in the profession of a devotion to the Union which has heretofore been too often associated with a public policy I deemed most dangerous to its safety, I will venture to add that no man over the boundless extent of our dominion has more reasons for inextinguishable attachment to it than myself. It is inwoven in my affections with the faithful labors in its support of two generations of my race. It is blended with a not inconsiderable personal stake in its continuity. It is mingled with my earnest prayers for the welfare of those who are treading

after me. And more than all these, it colors all my visions of the beneficent spread of Republican institutions as well in America as over the rest of the civilized world.

If then, so great a calamity as a division be about to befall us it shall be hastened by no act of mine. It shall come from the wilful passions of infatuated men, who demand it of us to destroy the great principles for which our fathers struggle in life and in death to stain our standard with the symbol of human oppression and to degrade us in the very hour of our victory, before our countrymen, before all the nations of the civilized world, and before God. Rather than this let the heavens fall. My duty is performed.



JEFFERSON DAVIS

JEFFERSON DAVIS



JEFFERSON DAVIS, statesman, champion of States rights and the slaveholding interests, and president during the Civil War of the Southern Confederacy, was born in Christian Co., Ky., June 3, 1808, and died at New Orleans, La., Dec. 6, 1889. He received a classical education at Transylvania University, graduated at West Point in 1828, and served as Lieutenant of Infantry and of Dragoons in the Black Hawk War, and in 1835 engaged in cotton planting in Mississippi. He was a presidential elector on the Polk and Dallas ticket in 1844; served in Congress from December, 1845, to June, 1846, when he resigned to command a regiment in the Mexican War, in which he distinguished himself at Monterey and Buena Vista. Declining the appointment of brigadier-general in the regular army in May, 1847, he was called to represent Mississippi in the United States Senate, where he remained until 1851. In the latter year he was defeated for Governor of Mississippi, but in 1853 became Secretary of War under President Pierce. In 1857, he was again chosen United States Senator, and served until Jan. 21, 1861, when his own State (Mississippi) seceded from the Union. In November, 1861, he was chosen president of the Confederate States, inaugurated in the following February, and remained at the head of the Confederacy until the close of the Rebellion. After the collapse of the South he was, in May, 1865, captured by Federal troops in Georgia, was imprisoned for two years at Fortress Monroe, and then released on bail. Though indicted for treason in May, 1866, he was never brought to trial; and finally pardoned in the general amnesty of December, 1868. In 1881, he published a vindication of his career and a history of the war in "The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government."

ON WITHDRAWAL FROM THE UNION; SECESSIONIST OPINION

UNITED STATES SENATE, JANUARY 21, 1862

I RISE, Mr. President, for the purpose of announcing to the Senate that I have satisfactory evidence that the State of Mississippi, by a solemn ordinance of her people in convention assembled, has declared her separation from the United States. Under these circumstances, of course my functions are terminated here. It has seemed

(287)

to me proper, however, that I should appear in the Senate to announce that fact to my associates, and I will say but very little more. The occasion does not invite me to go into argument, and my physical condition would not permit me to do so if it were otherwise; and yet it seems to become me to say something on the part of the State I here represent, on an occasion so solemn as this.

It is known to Senators who have served with me here, that I have for many years advocated, as an essential attribute of State sovereignty, the right of a State to secede from the Union. Therefore, if I had not believed there was justifiable cause; if I had thought that Mississippi was acting without sufficient provocation, or without an existing necessity, I should still, under my theory of the government, because of my allegiance to the State of which I am a citizen, have been bound by her action. I, however, may be permitted to say that I do think that she has justifiable cause, and I approve of her act. I conferred with her people before that act was taken, counselled them then that if the state of things which they apprehended should exist when the convention met, they should take the action which they have now adopted.

I hope none who hear me will confound this expression of mine with the advocacy of the right of a State to remain in the Union, and to disregard its constitutional obligations by the nullification of the law. Such is not my theory. Nullification and secession, so often confounded, are indeed antagonistic principles. Nullification is a remedy which it is sought to apply within the Union, and against the agent of the States. It is only to be justified when the agent has violated his constitutional obligation, and a State, assuming to judge for itself, denies the right of the agent thus to act,

and appeals to the other States of the Union for a decision; but when the States themselves, and when the people of the States, have so acted as to convince us that they will not regard our constitutional rights, then, and then for the first time, arises the doctrine of secession in its practical application.

A great man who now reposes with his fathers, and who has been often arraigned for a want of fealty to the Union, advocated the doctrine of nullification, because it preserved the Union. It was because of his deep-seated attachment to the Union, his determination to find some remedy for existing ills short of a severance of the ties which bound South Carolina to the other States, that Mr. Calhoun advocated the doctrine of nullification, which he proclaimed to be peaceful, to be within the limits of State power, not to disturb the Union, but only to be a means of bringing the agent before the tribunal of the States for their judgment.

Secession belongs to a different class of remedies. It is to be justified upon the basis that the States are sovereign. There was a time when none denied it. I hope the time may come again, when a better comprehension of the theory of our government, and the inalienable rights of the people of the States, will prevent any one from denying that each State is a sovereign, and thus may reclaim the grants which it has made to any agent whomsoever.

I therefore say I concur in the action of the people of Mississippi, believing it to be necessary and proper, and should have been bound by their action if my belief had been otherwise; and this brings me to the important point which I wish on this last occasion to present to the Senate. It is by this confounding of nullification and secession that the name of the great man, whose ashes now mingle with his

mother earth, has been invoked to justify coercion against a seceded State. The phrase "to execute the laws" was an expression which General Jackson applied to the case of a State refusing to obey the laws while yet a member of the Union. That is not the case which is now presented. The laws are to be executed over the United States, and upon the people of the United States. They have no relation to any foreign country. It is a perversion of terms, at least it is a great misapprehension of the case, which cites that expression for application to a State which has withdrawn from the Union. You may make war on a foreign State. If it be the purpose of gentlemen, they may make war against a State which has withdrawn from the Union; but there are no laws of the United States to be executed within the limits of a seceded State. A State finding herself in the condition in which Mississippi has judged she is, in which her safety requires that she should provide for the maintenance of her rights out of the Union, surrenders all the benefits (and they are known to be many), deprives herself of the advantages (they are known to be great), severs all the ties of affection (and they are close and enduring), which have bound her to the Union; and thus divesting herself of every benefit, taking upon herself every burden, she claims to be exempt from any power to execute the laws of the United States within her limits.

I well remember an occasion when Massachusetts was arraigned before the bar of the Senate, and when then the doctrine of coercion was rife and to be applied against her because of the rescue of a fugitive slave in Boston. My opinion then was the same that it is now. Not in a spirit of egotism, but to show that I am not influenced in my opinion because the case is my own, I refer to that time

and that occasion as containing the opinion which I then entertained, and on which my present conduct is based. I then said, if Massachusetts, following her through a stated line of conduct, chooses to take the last step which separates her from the Union, it is her right to go, and I will neither vote one dollar nor one man to coerce her back; but will say to her, God speed, in memory of the kind associations which once existed between her and the other States.

It has been a conviction of pressing necessity, it has been a belief that we are to be deprived in the Union of the rights which our fathers bequeathed to us, which has brought Mississippi into her present decision. She has heard proclaimed the theory that all men are created free and equal, and this made the basis of an attack upon her social institutions; and the sacred Declaration of Independence has been invoked to maintain the position of the equality of the races. That Declaration of Independence is to be construed by the circumstances and purposes for which it was made. The communities were declaring their independence; the people of those communities were asserting that no man was born—to use the language of Mr. Jefferson—booted and spurred to ride over the rest of mankind; that men were created equal—meaning the men of the political community; that there was no divine right to rule; that no man inherited the right to govern; that there were no classes by which power and place descended to families, but that all stations were equally within the grasp of each member of the body politic. These were the great principles they announced; these were the purposes for which they made their declaration; these were the ends to which their enunciation was directed. They have no reference to the slave; else, how happened it that

among the items of arraignment made against George III. was that he endeavored to do just what the North had been endeavoring of late to do—to stir up insurrection among our slaves? Had the Declaration announced that the negroes were free and equal, how was the prince to be arraigned for stirring up insurrection among them? And how was this to be enumerated among the high crimes which caused the Colonies to sever their connection with the mother country? When our Constitution was formed, the same idea was rendered more palpable, for there we find provision made for that very class of persons as property; they were not put upon the footing of equality with white men—not even upon that of paupers and convicts; but, so far as representation was concerned, were discriminated against as a lower caste, only to be represented in the numerical proportion of three-fifths.

Then, Senators, we recur to the compact which binds us together; we recur to the principles upon which our government was founded; and when you deny them, and when you deny to us the right to withdraw from a government which, thus perverted, threatens to be destructive of our rights, we but tread in the path of our fathers when we proclaim our independence, and take the hazard. This is done not in hostility to others, not to injure any section of the country, nor even for our own pecuniary benefit; but from the high and solemn motive of defending and protecting the rights we inherited, and which it is our sacred duty to transmit unshorn to our children.

I find in myself, perhaps, a type of the general feeling of my constituents toward yours. I am sure I feel no hostility to you, Senators from the North. I am sure there is not one of you, whatever sharp discussion there may have

been between us, to whom I cannot now say, in the presence of my God, I wish you well; and such, I am sure, is the feeling of the people whom I represent toward those whom you represent. I therefore feel that I but express their desire when I say I hope, and they hope, for peaceful relations with you, though we must part. They may be mutually beneficial to us in the future, as they have been in the past, if you so will it. The reverse may bring disaster on every portion of the country; and if you will have it thus, we will invoke the God of our fathers, who delivered them from the power of the lion, to protect us from the ravages of the bear; and thus, putting our trust in God, and in our own firm hearts and strong arms, we will vindicate the right as best we may.

In the course of my service here, associated at different times with a great variety of Senators, I see now around me some with whom I have served long; there have been points of collision; but whatever of offence there has been to me, I leave here; I carry with me no hostile remembrance. Whatever offence I have given which has not been redressed, or for which satisfaction has not been demanded, I have, Senators, in this hour of our parting, to offer you my apology for any pain which, in heat of discussion, I have inflicted. I go hence unencumbered of the remembrance of any injury received, and having discharged the duty of making the only reparation in my power for any injury offered.

Mr. President, and Senators, having made the announcement which the occasion seemed to me to require, it only remains for me to bid you a final adieu.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA, FEBRUARY 18, 1861

Gentlemen of the Congress of the Confederate States of America, Friends and Fellow Citizens:

OUR present condition, achieved in a manner unprecedented in the history of nations, illustrates the American idea that governments rest upon the consent of the governed, and that it is the right of the people to alter and abolish governments whenever they become destructive to the ends for which they were established. The declared compact of the Union from which we have withdrawn was to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity; and when in the judgment of the sovereign States now composing this Confederacy it has been perverted from the purposes for which it was ordained, and ceased to answer the ends for which it was established, a peaceful appeal to the ballot-box declared that, so far as they were concerned, the government created by that compact should cease to exist. In this they merely asserted the right which the Declaration of Independence of 1776 defined to be inalienable. Of the time and occasion of this exercise they as sovereigns were the final judges, each for himself. The impartial, enlightened verdict of mankind will vindicate the rectitude of our conduct; and He who knows the hearts of men will judge of the sincerity with which we labored to preserve the government of our fathers in its spirit.

The right solemnly proclaimed at the birth of the States, and which has been affirmed and reaffirmed in the bills of rights of the States subsequently admitted into the Union of 1789, undeniably recognizes in the people the power to resume the authority delegated for the purposes of government. Thus the sovereign States here represented proceeded to form this Confederacy; and it is by the abuse of language that their act has been denominated revolution. They formed a new alliance, but within each State its government has remained. The rights of person and property have not been disturbed. The agent through whom they communicated with foreign nations is changed, but this does not necessarily interrupt their international relations. Sustained by the consciousness that the transition from the former Union to the present Confederacy has not proceeded from a disregard on our part of our just obligations or any failure to perform every constitutional duty, moved by no interest or passion to invade the rights of others, anxious to cultivate peace and commerce with all nations, if we may not hope to avoid war, we may at least expect that posterity will acquit us of having needlessly engaged in it. Doubly justified by the absence of wrong on our part, and by wanton aggression on the part of others, there can be no use to doubt the courage and patriotism of the people of the Confederate States will be found equal to any measure of defence which soon their security may require.

An agricultural people, whose chief interest is the export of a commodity required in every manufacturing country, our true policy is peace and the freest trade which our necessities will permit. It is alike our interest and that of all those to whom we would sell, and from whom we would buy, that there should be the fewest practicable restrictions

upon the interchange of commodities. There can be but little rivalry between ours and any manufacturing or navigating community, such as the northeastern States of the American Union. It must follow, therefore, that mutual interest would invite good-will and kind offices. If, however, passion or lust of dominion should cloud the judgment or inflame the ambition of those States, we must prepare to meet the emergency, and maintain by the final arbitrament of the sword the position which we have assumed among the nations of the earth.

We have entered upon a career of independence, and it must be inflexibly pursued through many years of controversy with our late associates of the Northern States. We have vainly endeavored to secure tranquillity and obtain respect for the rights to which we were entitled. As a necessity, not a choice, we have resorted to the remedy of separation, and henceforth our energies must be directed to the conduct of our own affairs, and the perpetuity of the Confederacy which we have formed. If a just perception of mutual interest shall permit us peaceably to pursue our separate political career, my most earnest desire will have been fulfilled. But if this be denied us, and the integrity of our territory and jurisdiction be assailed, it will but remain for us with firm resolve to appeal to arms and invoke the blessing of Providence on a just cause. . . .

Actuated solely by a desire to preserve our own rights, and to promote our own welfare, the separation of the Confederate States has been marked by no aggression upon others, and followed by no domestic convulsion. Our industrial pursuits have received no check, the cultivation of our fields progresses as heretofore, and even should we be involved in war, there would be no considerable diminu-

tion in the production of the staples which have constituted our exports, in which the commercial world has an interest scarcely less than our own. This common interest of producer and consumer can only be intercepted by an exterior force which should obstruct its transmission to foreign markets, a course of conduct which would be detrimental to manufacturing and commercial interests abroad.

Should reason guide the action of the government from which we have separated, a policy so detrimental to the civilized world, the Northern States included, could not be dictated by even a stronger desire to inflict injury upon us; but if it be otherwise, a terrible responsibility will rest upon it, and the suffering of millions will bear testimony to the folly and wickedness of our aggressors. In the meantime there will remain to us, besides the ordinary remedies before suggested, the well-known resources for retaliation upon the commerce of an enemy. . . . We have changed the constituent parts but not the system of our government. The Constitution formed by our fathers is that of these Confederate States. In their exposition of it, and in the judicial construction it has received, we have a light which reveals its true meaning. Thus instructed as to the just interpretation of that instrument, and ever remembering that all offices are but trusts held for the people, and that delegated powers are to be strictly construed, I will hope by due diligence in the performance of my duties, though I may disappoint your expectation, yet to retain, when retiring, something of the good-will and confidence which will welcome my entrance into office.

It is joyous in the midst of perilous times to look around upon a people united in heart, when one purpose of high resolve animates and actuates the whole, where the sacri-

fices to be made are not weighed in the balance, against honor, right, liberty, and equality. Obstacles may retard, but they cannot long prevent, the progress of a movement sanctioned by its justice and sustained by a virtuous people. Reverently let us invoke the God of our fathers to guide and protect us in our efforts to perpetuate the principles which by his blessing they were able to vindicate, establish, and transmit to their posterity; and with a continuance of his favor, ever gratefully acknowledged, we may hopefully look forward to success, to peace, to prosperity.

NO DIVIDED FLAG

FROM REPLY TO SENATOR DOUGLAS, UNITED STATES SENATE,
MAY 1860

WE believed then, as I believe now, that this Union, as a compact entered into between the States, was to be preserved by good faith and by a close observance of the terms on which we were united. We believed then, as I believe now, that the party which rested upon the basis of truth; promulgated its opinions, and had them tested in the alembic of public opinion, adopted the only path of safety. I cannot respect such a doctrine as that which says "you may construe the constitution your way and I will construe it mine; we will waive the merit of these two constructions and harmonize together until the courts decide the question between us." A man is bound to have an opinion upon any political subject upon which he is called to act; it is skulking his responsibility for a citizen to say "let us express no opinion, I will agree that you may have yours, and I will have mine; we will co-operate politically together, we

will beat the opposition, divide the spoils, and leave it to the courts to decide the question of creed between us."

I do not believe that this is the path of safety; I am sure it is not the way of honor. I believe it devolves on us, who are principally sufferers from the danger to which this policy has exposed us, to affirm the truth boldly and let the people decide after the promulgation of our opinions. Our government, resting as it does upon public opinion and popular consent, was not formed to deceive the people nor does it regard the men in office as a governing class. We, the functionaries, should derive our opinions from the people. To know what their opinion is it is necessary that we should pronounce, in unmistakable language, what we ourselves mean.

My position is that there is no portion of our country where the people are not sufficiently intelligent to discriminate between right and wrong, and no portion where the sense of justice does not predominate. I therefore have been always willing to unfurl our flag to its innermost fold, to nail it to the mast with all our principles plainly inscribed upon it. Believing that we ask nothing but what the constitution was intended to confer; nothing but that which, as equals, we are entitled to receive; I am willing that our case should be plainly stated to those who have to decide it and await, for good or for evil, their verdict. . . .

Mr. President, after having for forty years been engaged in bitter controversy over a question relating to common property of the States, we have reached the point where the issue is presented in a form in which it becomes us to meet it according to existing facts; where it has ceased to be a question to be decided on the footing of authority and by reference to history. We have decided that too long had

this question been disturbing the peace and endangering the Union, and it was resolved to provide for its settlement by treating it as a judicial question. Now, will it be said, after Congress provided for the adjustment of this question by the courts, and after the courts had a case brought before them and expressed an opinion covering the controversy, that no additional latitude is to be given to the application of the decision of the court, though Congress had referred specially to them; that it is to be treated simply and technically as a question of *meum et tuum*, such as might have arisen if there had been no such legislation by Congress? Surely it does not become those who have pointed us to that provision as the peace offering, as the means for final adjustment, now to say that it meant nothing more than that the courts would go on hereafter, as heretofore, to try questions of property.

The courts have decided the question so far as they could decide any political question. A case arose in relation to property in a slave held within a Territory where a law of Congress declared that such property should not be held. The whole case was before them; everything except the mere technical point that the law was not enacted by a Territorial legislature. Why, then, if we are to abide by the decision of the supreme court in any future case, do they maintain this controversy on the mere technical point which now divides, disturbs, distracts, destroys the efficiency and the power of the Democratic party? To the senator, I know, as a question of property, it is a matter of no consequence. I should do him injustice if I left any one to infer that I treated his argument as one made by a man prejudiced against the character of property involved in the question. That is not his position; but I assert that he is pursuing an *ignis fatuus*—not

a light caught from the constitution—but a vapor which has arisen from the corrupting cesspools of sectional strife, of faction and individual rivalry. Measured by any standard of common sense, its magnitude would be too small to disturb the adjustment of the balance of our country. There can be no appeal to humanity made upon this basis. Least of all could it be made to one who like the senator and myself has seen this species of property in its sparse condition on the northwestern frontier, and seen it go out without disturbing the tranquillity of the community, as it had previously existed without injury to any one, if not to the benefit of the individual who held it. He has no apprehension, he can have none, that it is to retard the political prosperity of the future States—now the Territories. He can have no apprehension that in that country to which they never would be carried except for domestic purposes, they could ever so accumulate as to constitute a great political element. He knows and every man who has had experience and judgment must admit that the few who may be so carried there have nothing to fear but the climate, and that living in that close connection which belongs to one or half a dozen of them in a family, the kindest relations which it is possible to exist between master and dependent, exist between these domestics and their owners.

There is a relation belonging to this species of property, unlike that of the apprentice or the hired man, which awakens whatever there is of kindness or of nobility of soul in the heart of him who owns it; this can only be alienated, obscured, or destroyed by collecting this species of property into such masses that the owner is not personally acquainted with the individuals who compose it. In the relation, however, which can exist in the Northwestern Territories, the mere domestic

connection of one, two, or at most half a dozen servants in a family, associating with the children as they grow up, attending upon age as it declines, there can be nothing against which either philanthropy or humanity can make an appeal. Not even the emancipationist could raise his voice for this is the high road and the open gate to the condition in which the masters would from interest in a few years desire the emancipation of every one who may thus be taken to the north-western frontier.

Mr. President, I briefly and reluctantly referred, because the subject had been introduced, to the attitude of Mississippi on a former occasion. I will now as briefly say that in 1851 and in 1860 Mississippi was and is ready to make every concession which it becomes her to make to the welfare and the safety of the Union. If on a former occasion she hoped too much from fraternity, the responsibility for her disappointment rests upon those who fail to fulfil her expectations. She still clings to the government as our fathers formed it. She is ready to-day and to-morrow, as in her past and though brief yet brilliant history, to maintain that government in all its power, and to vindicate its honor with all the means she possesses. I say brilliant history; for it was in the very morning of her existence that her sons on the plains of New Orleans were announced in general orders to have been the admiration of one army and the wonder of the other. That we had a division in relation to the measures enacted in 1850 is true; that the Southern rights men became the minority in the election which resulted is true; but no figure of speech could warrant the senator in speaking of them as subdued; as coming to him or anybody else for quarter. I deemed it offensive when it was uttered, and the scorn with which I repelled it at the instant, time has only softened to con-

tempt. Our flag was never borne from the field. We had carried it in the face of defeat with a knowledge that defeat awaited it; but scarcely had the smoke of the battle passed away which proclaimed another victor, before the general voice admitted that the field again was ours; I have not seen a sagacious reflecting man, who was cognizant of the events as they transpired at the time, who does not say that within two weeks after the election our party was in a majority; and the next election which occurred showed that we possessed the State beyond controversy. How we have wielded that power it is not for me to say. I trust others may see forbearance in our conduct—that with a determination to insist upon our constitutional rights then and now there is an unwavering desire to maintain the government and to uphold the Democratic party.

We believe now as we have asserted on former occasions that the best hope for the perpetuity of our institutions depends upon the co-operation, the harmony, the zealous action of the Democratic party. We cling to that party from conviction, that its principles and its aims are those of truth and the country, as we cling to the Union for the fulfilment of the purposes for which it was formed. Whenever we shall be taught that the Democratic party is recreant to its principles; whenever we shall learn that it cannot be relied upon to maintain the great measures which constitute its vitality, I for one shall be ready to leave it. And so, when we declare our tenacious adherence to the Union it is the Union of the constitution. If the compact between the States is to be trampled into the dust; if anarchy is to be substituted for the usurpation and consolidation which threatened the government at an earlier period; if the Union is to become powerless for the purposes for which it

was established, and we are vainly to appeal to it for protection, then, sir, conscious of the rectitude of our course, the justice of our cause, self-reliant, yet humbly, confidently trusting in the arm that guided and protected our fathers, we look beyond the confines of the Union for the maintenance of our rights. A habitual reverence and cherished affection for the government will bind us to it longer than our interests would suggest or require; but he is a poor student of the world's history who does not understand that communities at last must yield to the dictates of their interests. That the affection, the mutual desire for the mutual good which existed among our fathers may be weakened in succeeding generations by the denial of right and hostile demonstration, until the equality guaranteed but not secured within the Union may be sought for without it, must be evident to even a careless observer of our race. It is time to be up and doing. There is yet time to remove the causes of dissension and alienation which are now distracting and have for years past divided the country.

If the senator correctly described me as having in a former period against my own preferences and opinions acquiesced in the decision of my party; if when I had youth, when physical vigor gave promise of many days and the future was painted in the colors of hope, I could thus surrender my own convictions, my own prejudices, and co-operate with my political friends, according to their views as to the best method of promoting the public good; now, when the years of my future cannot be many, and experience has sobered the hopeful tints of youth's gilding; when approaching the evening of life, the shadows are reversed and the mind turns retrospectively, it is not to be supposed that I would abandon lightly or idly put on trial the party to which I have steadily adhered. It

is rather to be assumed that conservatism which belongs to the timidity or caution of increasing years would lead me to cling to; to be supported by rather than to cast off the organization with which I have been so long connected. If I am driven to consider the necessity of separating myself from those old and dear relations, of discarding the accustomed support, under circumstances such as I have described, might not my friends who differ from me pause and inquire whether there is not something involved in it which calls for their careful revision?

I desire no divided flag for the Democratic party, seek not to depreciate the power of the senator or take from him anything of that confidence he feels in the large army which follows his standard. I prefer that his banner should lie in its silken folds to feed the moth; but if it unrestrainedly rustles impatient to be unfurled, we who have not invited the conflict shrink not from the trial; we will plant our flag on every hill and plain; it shall overlook the Atlantic and welcome the sun as he rises from its dancing waters; it shall wave its adieu as he sinks to repose in the quiet Pacific.

Our principles are national; they belong to every State of the Union; and though elections may be lost by their assertion, they constitute the only foundation on which we can maintain power on which we can again rise to the dignity the Democracy once possessed. Does not the senator from Illinois see in the sectional character of the vote he received that his opinions are not acceptable to every portion of the country? Is not the fact that the resolutions adopted by seventeen States on which the greatest reliance must be placed for Democratic support are in opposition to the dogma to which he still clings, a warning that if he persists and succeeds in forcing his theory upon the Democratic party its days are

numbered? We ask only for the constitution. We ask of the Democracy only from time to time to declare as current exigencies may indicate what the constitution was intended to secure and provide. Our flag bears no new device. Upon its folds our principles are written in living light; all proclaiming the constitutional Union, justice, equality, and fraternity of our ocean-bound domain for a limitless future.

CHIEF-JUSTICE CHASE



ALMON PORTLAND CHASE, distinguished American statesman and jurist, and for nine years (1864-73) Chief-Justice of the Supreme Court, was born at Cornish, N. H., Jan. 13, 1808, and died at New York, May 7, 1873. He received his education at Dartmouth College and subsequently studied law under William Wirt, was admitted to the Bar in 1829, and the next year began practice at Cincinnati. An edition of the Statutes of Ohio prepared by him brought him into notice, and in 1834 he was appointed Solicitor for the United States Bank in Cincinnati. He engaged in the anti-slavery movement in 1837 as counsel for a fugitive slave, and in 1842 defended Van Zandt, the original of Van Tromp in "Uncle Tom's Cabin," who was indicted for aiding slaves to escape. The case was carried to the Supreme Court of the United States and there argued in 1848 by Seward and by Chase. His connection with this famous case brought the future Chief-Justice into prominence as an anti-slavery champion, and in 1849 he was elected to the United States Senate. In 1855, he was chosen Governor of Ohio, and in 1857 was reelected to that office. In 1861, he entered Lincoln's cabinet as Secretary of State, and continued to occupy that responsible position until 1864, when he was appointed Chief-Justice of the United States, a post he held until his death. As Chief-Justice he presided at the impeachment trial of President Johnson. Chase was a man of unusual abilities, and during the Civil War era was of great service to the government. His legal opinions are noted for the excellence of their literary style, and are deemed models of juridical composition.

SPEECH ON THE KANSAS-NEBRASKA BILL

DELIVERED IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE, FEBRUARY 3, 1854

[The bill for the organization of the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas being under consideration, Mr. Chase submitted the following amendment: "Strike out from section 14 the words 'was superseded by the principles of the legislation of 1850, commonly called the compromise measures, and'; so that the clause will read: 'That the constitution and all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within the said Territory of Nebraska as elsewhere within the United States, except the eighth section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, approved March 6, 1820, which is hereby declared inoperative,'" and proceeded to say:]

MR. PRESIDENT,—I had occasion a few days ago to expose the utter groundlessness of the personal charges made by the senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] against myself and the other signers of the Independent Democratic Appeal. I now move to strike from this

bill a statement which I will to-day demonstrate to be without any foundation in fact or history. I intend afterward to move to strike out the whole clause annulling the Missouri prohibition.

I enter into this debate, Mr. President, in no spirit of personal unkindness. The issue is too grave and too momentous for the influence of such feelings. I see the great question before me and that question only.

Sir, these crowded galleries, these thronged lobbies, this full attendance of the Senate, prove the deep, transcendent interest of the theme.

A few days only have elapsed since the Congress of the United States assembled in this Capitol. Then no agitation seemed to disturb the political elements. Two of the great political parties of the country in their national conventions had announced that slavery agitation was at an end, and that henceforth that subject was not to be discussed in Congress or out of Congress. The President in his annual message had referred to this state of opinion and had declared his fixed purpose to maintain, as far as any responsibility attached to him, the quiet of the country. Let me read a brief extract from that message:

"It is no part of my purpose to give prominence to any subject which may properly be regarded as set at rest by the deliberate judgment of the people. But while the present is bright with promise, and the future full of demand and inducement for the exercise of active intelligence, the past can never be without useful lessons of admonition and instruction. If its dangers serve not as beacons, they will evidently fail to fulfil the object of a wise design.

"When the grave shall have closed over all those who are now endeavoring to meet the obligations of duty, the year 1850 will be recurred to as a period filled with anxious apprehension. A successful war had just terminated. Peace

brought with it a vast augmentation of territory. Disturbing questions arose bearing upon the domestic institutions of one portion of the confederacy, and involving the constitutional rights of the States. But notwithstanding differences of opinion and sentiment which then existed in relation to details and specific provisions, the acquiescence of distinguished citizens, whose devotion to the Union can never be doubted, had given renewed vigor to our institutions and restored a sense of repose and security to the public mind throughout the confederacy. That this repose is to suffer no shock during my official term, if I have power to avert it, those who placed me here may be assured."

The agreement of the two old political parties thus referred to by the chief magistrate of the country was complete, and a large majority of the American people seemed to acquiesce in the legislation of which he spoke.

A few of us indeed doubted the accuracy of these statements and the permanency of this repose. We never believed that the acts of 1850 would prove to be a permanent adjustment of the slavery question. We believed no permanent adjustment of that question possible except by a return to that original policy of the fathers of the Republic, by which slavery was restricted within State limits, and freedom without exception or limitation was intended to be secured to every person outside of State limits and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the general government.

But, sir, we only represented a small though vigorous and growing party in the country. Our number was small in Congress. By some we were regarded as visionaries—by some as factionists; while almost all agreed in pronouncing us mistaken.

And so, sir, the country was at peace. As the eye swept the entire circumference of the horizon and upward to mid-heaven not a cloud appeared; to common observation there was no mist or stain upon the clearness of the sky.

But suddenly all is changed. Rattling thunder breaks from the cloudless firmament. The storm bursts forth in fury. Warring winds rush into conflict:

“Eurus, Notusque ruunt, creberque procellis Africus.”

Yes, sir, “*creber procellis Africus*”—the South wind thick with storm. And now we find ourselves in the midst of an agitation the end and issue of which no man can foresee.

Now, sir, who is responsible for this renewal of strife and controversy? Not we, for we have introduced no question of territorial slavery into Congress—not we who are denounced as agitators and factionists. No, sir; the quietists and the finalists have become agitators; they who told us that all agitation was quieted, and that the resolutions of the political conventions put a final period to the discussion of slavery.

This will not escape the observation of the country. It is slavery that renews the strife. It is slavery that again wants room. It is slavery, with its insatiate demands for more slave territory and more slave States.

And what does slavery ask for now? Why, sir, it demands that a time-honored and sacred compact shall be rescinded—a compact which has endured through a whole generation—a compact which has been universally regarded as inviolable, North and South—a compact, the constitutionality of which few have doubted and by which all have consented to abide.

It will not answer to violate such a compact without a pretext. Some plausible ground must be discovered or invented for such an act; and such a ground is supposed to be found in the doctrine which was advanced the other day by the senator from Illinois, that the compromise acts of 1850

“superseded” the prohibition of slavery north of 36 degrees 30 minutes, in the act preparatory for the admission of Missouri. Aye, sir, “superseded” is the phrase—“superseded by the principles of the legislation of 1850, commonly called the compromise measures.”

It is against this statement, untrue in fact and without foundation in history, that the amendment which I have proposed is directed.

Sir, this is a novel idea. At the time when these measures were before Congress in 1850, when the questions involved in them were discussed from day to day, from week to week, and from month to month, in this Senate chamber, who ever heard that the Missouri prohibition was to be superseded? What man, at what time, in what speech, ever suggested the idea that the acts of that year were to affect the Missouri compromise?

The senator from Illinois the other day invoked the authority of Henry Clay—that departed statesman in respect to whom whatever may be the differences of political opinion none question that among the great men of this country he stood proudly eminent. Did he in the report made by him as the chairman of the Committee of Thirteen, or in any speech in support of the compromise acts, or in any conversation in the committee or out of the committee, ever even hint at this doctrine of supersedure? Did any supporter or any opponent of the compromise acts ever vindicate or condemn them on the ground that the Missouri prohibition would be affected by them? Well, sir, the compromise acts were passed. They were denounced North, and they were denounced South. Did any defender of them at the South ever justify his support of them upon the ground that the South had obtained through them the repeal of the Missouri pro-

hibition? Did any objector to them at the North ever even suggest as a ground of condemnation that that prohibition was swept away by them? No, sir! No man, North or South, during the whole of the discussion of those acts here, or in that other discussion which followed their enactment throughout the country ever intimated any such opinion.

Now, sir, let us come to the last session of Congress. A Nebraska bill passed the House and came to the Senate and was reported from the committee on Territories by the senator from Illinois as its chairman. Was there any provision in it which even squinted toward this notion of repeal by supersedure? Why, sir, Southern gentlemen opposed it on the very ground that it left the Territory under the operation of the Missouri prohibition. The senator from Illinois made a speech in defence of it. Did he invoke Southern support upon the ground that it superseded the Missouri prohibition? Not at all. Was it opposed or vindicated by anybody on any such ground? Every senator knows the contrary. The senator from Missouri [Mr. Atchison], now the president of this body, made a speech upon the bill in which he distinctly declared that the Missouri prohibition was not repealed and could not be repealed.

I will send this speech to the secretary and ask him to read the paragraphs marked.

The secretary read as follows:

“I will now state to the Senate the views which induced me to oppose this proposition in the early part of this session.

“I had two objections to it. One was that the Indian title in that Territory had not been extinguished, or at least a very small portion of it had been. Another was the Missouri compromise, or as it is commonly called, the slavery restriction. It was my opinion at that time—and I am not now very clear on that subject—that the law of Congress when the State of

Missouri was admitted into the Union excluding slavery from the Territory of Louisiana north of 36 degrees 30 minutes, would be enforced in that Territory unless it was specially rescinded, and whether that law was in accordance with the constitution of the United States or not, it would do its work, and that work would be to preclude slaveholders from going into that Territory. But when I came to look into that question I found that there was no prospect, no hope, of a repeal of the Missouri compromise excluding slavery from that Territory.

"Now, sir, I am free to admit that at this moment, at this hour, and for all time to come, I should oppose the organization or the settlement of that Territory unless my constituents and the constituents of the whole South—of the slave States of the Union,—could go into it upon the same footing, with equal rights and equal privileges, carrying that species of property with them as other people of this Union. Yes, sir, I acknowledged that that would have governed me, but I have no hope that the restriction will ever be repealed.

"I have always been of opinion that the first great error committed in the political history of this country was the Ordinance of 1787, rendering the Northwest Territory free territory. The next great error was the Missouri compromise. But they are both irremediable. There is no remedy for them. We must submit to them. I am prepared to do it. It is evident that the Missouri compromise cannot be repealed. So far as that question is concerned we might as well agree to the admission of this Territory now as next year or five or ten years hence."¹

That, sir, is the speech of the senator from Missouri [Mr. Atchison] whose authority I think must go for something upon this question. What does he say? "When I came to look into that question"—of the possible repeal of the Missouri prohibition—that was the question he was looking into—"I found that there was no prospect, no hope of a repeal of the Missouri compromise excluding slavery from that Territory." And yet, sir, at that very moment, according to this

¹ "Congressional Globe," Second Session, 32d Cong., vol. xxvi, p. 1118.

new doctrine of the senator from Illinois, it had been repealed three years!

Well, the senator from Missouri said further that if he thought it possible to oppose this restriction successfully he never would consent to the organization of the Territory until it was rescinded. "But," said he, "I acknowledge that I have no hope that the restriction will ever be repealed." Then he made some complaint, as other Southern gentlemen have frequently done, of the Ordinance of 1787, and the Missouri prohibition; but went on to say: "They are both irremediable; there is no remedy for them; we must submit to them; I am prepared to do it, it is evident that the Missouri compromise cannot be repealed."

Now, sir, when was this said? It was on the morning of the 4th of March, just before the close of the last session, when that Nebraska bill, reported by the senator from Illinois, which proposed no repeal and suggested no supersedure, was under discussion. I think, sir, that all this shows pretty clearly that up to the very close of the last session of Congress nobody had ever thought of a repeal by supersedure. Then, what took place at the commencement of the present session? The senator from Iowa early in December introduced a bill for the organization of the Territory of Nebraska. I believe it was the same bill which was under discussion here at the last session, line for line, word for word. If I am wrong the senator will correct me.

Did the senator from Iowa then entertain the idea that the Missouri prohibition had been superseded? No, sir, neither he nor any other man here, so far as could be judged from any discussion or statement or remark had received this notion.

Well, on the 4th day of January the Committee on Territories, through their chairman, the senator from Illinois,

made a report on the Territorial organization of Nebraska; and that report was accompanied by a bill. Now, sir, on that 4th day of January, just thirty days ago, did the Committee on Territories entertain the opinion that the compromise acts of 1850 superseded the Missouri prohibition? If they did they were very careful to keep it to themselves. We will judge the committee by their own report. What do they say in that? In the first place they describe the character of the controversy in respect to the Territories acquired from Mexico.

They say that some believed that a Mexican law prohibiting slavery was in force there, while others claimed that the Mexican law became inoperative at the moment of acquisition and that slaveholders could take their slaves into the Territory and hold them there under the provisions of the constitution. The Territorial compromise acts, as the committee tell us, steered clear of these questions. They simply provided that the States organized out of these Territories might come in with or without slavery, as they should elect, but did not affect the question whether slaves could or could not be introduced before the organization of State governments. That question was left entirely to judicial decision.

Well, sir, what did the committee propose to do with the Nebraska Territory? In respect to that, as in respect to the Mexican Territory, differences of opinion exist in relation to the introduction of slaves. There are Southern gentlemen who contend that notwithstanding the Missouri prohibition they can take their slaves into the territory covered by it and hold them there by virtue of the constitution. On the other hand the great majority of the American people North and South believe the Missouri prohibition to be constitutional and effectual. Now, what did the committee propose?

Did they propose to repeal the prohibition? Did they suggest that it had been superseded? Did they advance any idea of that kind? No, sir; this is their language:

“Under this section, as in the case of the Mexican law in New Mexico and Utah, it is a disputed point whether slavery is prohibited in the Nebraska country by valid enactment. The decision of this question involves the constitutional power of Congress to pass laws prescribing and regulating the domestic institutions of the various Territories of the Union. In the opinion of those eminent statesmen who hold that Congress is invested with no rightful authority to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories, the eighth section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri is null and void, while the prevailing sentiment in a large portion of the Union sustains the doctrine that the constitution of the United States secures to every citizen an inalienable right to move into any of the Territories with his property, of whatever kind and description, and to hold and enjoy the same under the sanction of law. Your committee do not feel themselves called upon to enter into the discussion of these controverted questions. They involve the same grave issues which produced the agitation, the sectional strife, and the fearful struggle of 1850.”

This language will bear repetition:

“Your committee do not feel themselves called upon to enter into the discussion of these controverted questions. They involve the same grave issues which produced the agitation, the sectional strife, and the fearful struggle of 1850.”

And they go on to say:

“Congress deemed it wise and prudent to refrain from deciding the matters in controversy then, either by affirming or repealing the Mexican laws or by an act declaratory of the true intent of the constitution and the extent of the protection afforded by it to slave property in the Territories; so your committee are not prepared now to recommend a departure from the course pursued on that memorable occasion, either by affirming or repealing the eighth section

of the Missouri act or by any act declaratory of the meaning of the constitution in respect to the legal points in dispute."

Mr. President, here are very remarkable facts. The committee on Territories declared that it was not wise, that it was not prudent, that it was not right to renew the old controversy and to arouse agitation. They declared that they would abstain from any recommendation of a repeal of the prohibition or of any provision declaratory of the construction of the constitution in respect to the legal points in dispute.

Mr. President, I am not one of those who suppose that the question between Mexican law and the slaveholding claims was avoided in the Utah and New Mexico act; nor do I think that the introduction into the Nebraska bill of the provisions of those acts in respect to slavery would leave the question between the Missouri prohibition and the same slaveholding claims entirely unaffected. I am of a very different opinion. But I am dealing now with the report of the senator from Illinois, as chairman of the committee, and I show beyond all controversy that that report gave no countenance whatever to the doctrine of repeal by supersedure.

Well, sir, the bill reported by the committee was printed in the "Washington Sentinel" on Saturday, January 7th. It contained twenty sections, no more, no less. It contained no provisions in respect to slavery except those in the Utah and New Mexico bills. It left those provisions to speak for themselves. This was in harmony with the report of the committee. On the 10th of January—on Tuesday—the act appeared again in the "Sentinel;" but it had grown longer during the interval. It appeared now with twenty-one sections. There was a statement in the paper that the twenty-first section had been omitted by a clerical error.

But, sir, it is a singular fact that this twenty-first section is entirely out of harmony with the committee's report. It undertakes to determine the effect of the provision in the Utah and New Mexico bills. It declares among other things that all questions pertaining to slavery in the Territories and in the new States to be formed therefrom are to be left to the decision of the people residing therein through their appropriate representatives. This provision in effect repealed the Missouri prohibition, which the committee in their report declared ought not to be done. Is it possible, sir, that this was a mere clerical error? May it not be that this twenty-first section was the fruit of some Sunday work between Saturday the 7th and Tuesday the 10th?

But, sir, the addition of this section it seems did not help the bill. It did not I suppose meet the approbation of Southern gentlemen, who contended that they have a right to take their slaves into the Territories notwithstanding any prohibition either by Congress or by a Territorial legislature. I dare say it was found that the votes of these gentlemen could not be had for the bill with that clause in it. It was not enough that the committee had abandoned their report and added this twenty-first section, in direct contravention of its reasonings and principles. The twenty-first section itself must be abandoned and the repeal of the Missouri prohibition placed in a shape which would not deny the slaveholding claim.

The senator from Kentucky [Mr. Dixon], on the 16th of January, submitted an amendment which came square up to repeal and to the claim. That amendment probably produced some fluttering and some consultation. It met the views of Southern senators and probably determined the shape which the bill has finally assumed. Of the various

mutations which it has undergone I can hardly be mistaken in attributing the last to the amendment of the senator from Kentucky. That there is no effect without a cause is among our earliest lessons in physical philosophy, and I know of no causes which will account for the remarkable changes which the bill underwent after the 16th of January, other than that amendment and the determination of Southern senators to support it, and to vote against any provision recognizing the right of any Territorial legislature to prohibit the introduction of slavery.

It was just seven days, Mr President, after the senator from Kentucky had offered his amendment that a fresh amendment was reported from the committee on Territories, in the shape of a new bill enlarged to forty sections. This new bill cuts off from the proposed Territory half a degree of latitude on the south and divides the residue into two Territories—the southern Territory of Kansas and the northern Territory of Nebraska. It applies to each all the provisions of the Utah and New Mexico bills; it rejects entirely the twenty-first clerical-error section and abrogates the Missouri prohibition by the very singular provision which I will read:

“The constitution and all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within the said Territory of Nebraska as elsewhere within the United States, except the eighth section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, approved March 6, 1820, which was superseded by the principles of the legislation of 1850, commonly called the compromise measures, and is therefore declared inoperative.”

Doubtless, Mr. President, this provision operates as a repeal of the prohibition. The senator from Kentucky was right when he said it was in effect the equivalent of his amend-

ment. Those who are willing to break up and destroy the old compact of 1820 can vote for this bill with full assurance that such will be its effect. But I appeal to them not to vote for this supersedure clause. I ask them not to incorporate into the legislation of the country a declaration which every one knows to be wholly untrue. I have said that this doctrine of supersedure is new. I have now proved that it is a plant of but ten days' growth. It was never seen or heard of until the 23d day of January, 1854. It was upon that day that this tree of Upas was planted; we already see its poison fruits.

The provision I have quoted abrogates the Missouri prohibition. It asserts no right in the Territorial legislature to prohibit slavery. . . .

The truth is that the compromise acts of 1850 were not intended to introduce any principles of Territorial organization applicable to any other Territory except that covered by them. The professed object of the friends of the compromise acts was to compose the whole slavery agitation. There were various matters of complaint. The non-surrender of fugitives from service was one. The existence of slavery and the slave-trade here in this District and elsewhere, under the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, was another. The apprehended introduction of slavery into the Territories furnished other grounds of controversy. The slave States complained of the free States and the free States complained of the slave States. It was supposed by some that this whole agitation might be stayed and finally put at rest by skilfully adjusted legislation. So, sir, we had the Omnibus Bill and its appendages, the Fugitive-Slave Bill and the District Slave-Trade Suppression Bill. To please the North—to please the free States—California was to be ad-

mitted and the slave depots here in the district were to be broken up. To please the slave States a stringent fugitive-slave act was to be passed and slavery was to have a chance to get into the new Territories. The support of the senators and representatives from Texas was to be gained by a liberal adjustment of boundary and by the assumption of a large portion of their State debt.

The general result contemplated was a complete and final adjustment of all questions relating to slavery.

The acts passed. A number of the friends of the acts signed a compact pledging themselves to support no man for any office who would in any way renew the agitation. The country was required to acquiesce in the settlement as an absolute finality. No man concerned in carrying those measures through Congress, and least of all the distinguished man whose efforts mainly contributed to their success, ever imagined that in the Territorial acts, which formed a part of the series, they were planting the germs of a new agitation. Indeed, I have proved that one of these acts contained an express stipulation which precludes the revival of the agitation in the form in which it is now thrust upon the country, without manifest disregard of the provisions of those acts themselves.

I have thus proved beyond controversy that the averment of the bill which my amendment proposes to strike out is untrue. Senators, will you unite in a statement which you know to be contradicted by the history of the country? Will you incorporate into a public statute an affirmation which is contradicted by every event which attended or followed the adoption of the compromise acts? Will you here, acting under your high responsibility as senators of the States, assert as a fact, by a solemn vote, that which the personal

recollection of every senator who was here during the discussion of those compromise acts disproves?

I will not believe it until I see it. If you wish to break up the time-honored compact embodied in the Missouri compromise, transferred into the joint resolution for the annexation of Texas, preserved and affirmed by these compromise acts themselves, do it openly—do it boldly. Repeal the Missouri prohibition. Repeal it by a direct vote. Do not repeal it by indirection. Do not “declare” it “inoperative,” “because superseded by the principles of the legislation of 1850.”

Mr. President, three great eras have marked the history of this country in respect to slavery. The first may be characterized as the “Era of Enfranchisement.” It commenced with the earliest struggles for national independence. The spirit which inspired it animated the hearts and prompted the efforts of Washington, of Jefferson, of Patrick Henry, of Wythe, of Adams, of Jay, of Hamilton, of Morris—in short, of all the great men of our early history.

All these hoped for, all these labored for, all these believed in, the final deliverance of the country from the curse of slavery. That spirit burned in the Declaration of Independence and inspired the provisions of the constitution and the Ordinance of 1787.

Under its influence, when in full vigor, State after State provided for the emancipation of the slaves within their limits prior to the adoption of the constitution. Under its feeblener influence at a later period, and during the administration of Mr. Jefferson, the importation of slaves was prohibited into Mississippi and Louisiana in the faint hope that those Territories might finally become free States. Gradually that spirit ceased to influence our public councils and lost its control over the American heart and the American policy.

Another era succeeded, but by such imperceptible gradations that the lines which separate the two cannot be traced with absolute precision. The facts of the two eras meet and mingle as the currents of confluent streams mix so imperceptibly that the observer cannot fix the spot where the meeting waters blend.

This second era was the "Era of Conservatism." Its great maxim was to preserve the existing condition. Men said: Let things remain as they are; let slavery stand where it is; exclude it where it is not; refrain from disturbing the public quiet by agitation; adjust all difficulties that arise, not by the application of principles, but by compromises.

It was during this period that the senator tells us that slavery was maintained in Illinois, both while a Territory and after it became a State, in despite of the provisions of the Ordinance. It is true, sir, that the slaves held in the Illinois country under the French law were not regarded as absolutely emancipated by the provisions of the ordinance. But full effect was given to the Ordinance in excluding the introduction of slaves, and thus the Territory was preserved from eventually becoming a slave State. The few slaveholders in the Territory of Indiana, which then included Illinois, succeeded in obtaining such an ascendancy in its affairs that repeated applications were made, not merely by conventions of delegates, but by the Territorial legislature itself, for a suspension of the clause in the Ordinance prohibiting slavery. These applications were reported upon by John Randolph of Virginia in the House and by Mr. Franklin in the Senate. Both the reports were against suspension. The grounds stated by Randolph are specially worthy of being considered now. They are thus stated in the report:

"That the committee deem it highly dangerous and inex-

pedient to impair a provision wisely calculated to promote the happiness and prosperity of the northwestern country and to give strength and security to that extensive frontier. In the salutary operation of this sagacious and benevolent restraint it is believed that the inhabitants of Indiana will at no very distant day find ample remuneration for a temporary privation of labor and of emigration."

Sir, these reports made in 1803 and 1807, and the action of Congress upon them in conformity with their recommendation saved Illinois and perhaps Indiana from becoming slave States. When the people of Illinois formed their State constitution they incorporated into it a section providing that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall hereafter be introduced into this State. The constitution made provision for the continued service of the few persons who were originally held as slaves and then bound to service under the Territorial laws and for the freedom of their children and thus secured the final extinction of slavery. The senator thinks that this result is not attributable to the Ordinance. I differ from him. But for the ordinance I have no doubt slavery would have been introduced into Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio. It is something to the credit of the "Era of Conservatism," uniting its influences with those of the expiring "Era of Emfranchisement," that it maintained the Ordinance of 1787 in the northwest.

The "Era of Conservatism" passed, also by imperceptible gradations, into the "Era of Slavery Propagandism." Under the influences of this new spirit we opened the whole territory acquired from Mexico, except California, to the ingress of slavery. Every foot of it was covered by a Mexican prohibition; and yet by the legislation of 1850 we consented to expose it to the introduction of slaves. Some, I believe, have actually been carried into Utah and New Mexico. They may

be few, perhaps, but a few are enough to affect materially the probable character of their future governments. Under the evil influences of the same spirit we are now called upon to reverse the original policy of the republic, to support even a solemn compact of the conservative period, and open Nebraska to slavery.

Sir, I believe that we are upon the verge of another era. That era will be the "Era of Reaction." The introduction of this question here and its discussion will greatly hasten its advent. We who insist upon the denationalization of slavery and upon the absolute divorce of the general government from all connection with it will stand with the men who favored the compromise acts and who yet wish to adhere to them in their letter and in their spirit against the repeal of the Missouri prohibition. But you may pass it here. You may send it to the other House. It may become a law.

But its effect will be to satisfy all thinking men that no compromises with slavery will endure except so long as they serve the interests of slavery; and that there is no safe and honorable ground for non-slaveholders to stand upon, except that of restricting slavery within State limits and excluding it absolutely from the whole sphere of federal jurisdiction. The old questions between political parties are at rest. No great question so thoroughly possesses the public mind as this of slavery. This discussion will hasten the inevitable reorganization of parties upon the new issues which our circumstances suggest. It will light up a fire in the country which may perhaps consume those who kindle it.

I cannot believe that the people of this country have so far lost sight of the maxims and principles of the Revolution, or are so insensible to the obligations which those maxims and principles impose, as to acquiesce in the violation of this compact.

NAPOLEON III



HARLES LOUIS NAPOLEON BONAPARTE, second French Emperor, was born at Paris, April 20, 1808, and died at Chiselhurst, England, Jan. 9, 1873. He was the reputed son of Louis Napoleon, king of Holland, and Hortense, step-daughter of Napoleon I. From his birth he was looked upon as the second heir of the empire, and Napoleon took interest in his education even after the birth of the King of Rome. After Waterloo, his mother having been exiled from France, he was brought up at Geneva, Switzerland, as well as at Augsburg, his mother's residence at Arenenberg, and at Rome. His military education he received at Constance, where he studied engineering, history, physics, and chemistry. In 1831, with his elder brother, Louis, he set out to assist the Romagna in its revolt against the Pope. The death of Louis in this expedition, followed by that of the Duke of Reichstadt (1832), made him the head of the Napoleonic dynasty. He returned to Paris with his mother, but, owing to a demonstration by the people on the anniversary of the death of Napoleon, Louis Philippe insisted on their departure and they proceeded to England. In 1832, he accepted the mission of leading the Polish insurrection and actually set out for the border, but the fall of Warsaw changed his plans. He returned to Switzerland and employed himself in the composition of various works. In recognition of his work on Switzerland, published in 1833, he was proclaimed a citizen of the Swiss republic. In 1835, he issued a "Manual of Artillery" which brought him into notice in military circles. During the five years that followed, he made two attempts to gain the throne of France, but both were failures. For the latter of these he was condemned to perpetual imprisonment; but in 1846 he managed to escape and returned to England. In 1848, he was elected deputy for Paris and three other departments, and in September he was made President of the republic. In December, 1851, by force of arms, he dissolved the constitution and was reëlected President for ten years. He then declared his design to restore the monarchy and assumed the title of Emperor. Among the chief events of his reign were the annexation of Savoy and Nice, the beautifying of Paris under the architect Baron Haussman, the great Paris exposition, and his taking part with the Allies in the Crimean War. He wrote the "Life of Cæsar" as a veiled defence of his political measures. In 1870, suspecting that the enthusiasm of his army was beginning to wane and desiring to rekindle its ardor, he declared war against Prussia, but, though he assumed the chief command, he failed to cross the Rhine, and after a disastrous campaign, was forced to surrender at Sedan, Sept. 2, 1870. In the following March he was allowed to join his wife, the Empress Eugenie, at Chiselhurst, England, where he resided till his death. Louis Napoleon, who was a nephew of Bonaparte, the first emperor, was in private, a kindly and amiable man, too much given to heed the councils of the clerical party at court and without any strong and capable advisers. He was a thinker and man of letters rather than a statesman, and "presuming on the accident of birth to seize absolute power, and to direct the affairs of a great nation, he proved himself totally incapable as an administrator, and allowed office, political and military, to fall into the most unfit hands."

SPEECH IN THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

OF my sentiments or of my opinions I shall not speak; I have already set them before you, and no one as yet has had reason to doubt my word. As to my parliamentary conduct, I will say that as I never permit myself the liberty of bringing any of my colleagues to an account for the course which he thinks proper to pursue, so, in like manner, I never recognize in him the right to call me to an account for mine; this account I owe only to my constituents.

Of what am I accused? Of accepting from the popular sentiment a nomination after which I have not sought. Well! I accept this nomination that does me so much honor; I accept it, because three successive elections and the unanimous decree of the National Assembly, reversing the proscriptions against my family, authorize me to believe that France regards the name I bear to be serviceable for the consolidation of society, now shaken to its foundations,—and for the establishment and prosperity of the Republic.

How little do those who charge me with ambition know my heart! If an imperative duty did not keep me here, if the sympathy of my fellow citizens did not console me for the violence of the attacks of some, and even for the impetuosity of the defences of others, long since would I have regretted my exile.

I am reproached for my silence! Few persons here are gifted with the faculty of eloquent speech, obedient to just and sound ideas. But is there only one way to serve our country? What she wants most of all is acts; what she wants is a government, firm, intelligent, and wise, more desirous to

heal the evils of society than to avenge them—a government that would openly set itself at the head of just ideas, and thus repel a thousand times more effectually than with bayonets those theories which are not founded on experience and reason.

I know that parties intend to set my path with pits and snares; but I shall not fall into them. I shall always follow in my own way the course which I have traced out, without troubling myself or stopping to see who is pleased. Nothing shall interrupt my tranquillity, nothing shall induce me to forget my duty. I have but one aim; it is to merit the esteem of the Assembly, and with this esteem, that of all good men, and the confidence of that magnanimous people that was made so light of here yesterday.

I declare, then, to those who may be willing to organize a system of provocation against me that henceforward I shall reply to no questioning, to no species of attack, to none who would have me speak when I prefer to be silent. Strong in the approval of my conscience, I shall remain immovable amidst all attacks, impassable towards all calumnies.

FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS AS PRESIDENT

CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVES,—The suffrages of the nation and the oath which I have taken command my future conduct. My duty is marked out; I shall fulfil it as a man of honor.

I shall treat as enemies of the country all those who may attempt to change, by illegal means, what entire France has established.

Between you and me, citizen representatives, no real dissensions should exist; our wills, our desires are the same.

I wish, like you, to place society on its bases, to strengthen democratic institutions, and to try every means to relieve the sufferings of the generous and intelligent people that has just given me such a splendid mark of confidence.

The majority which I have obtained not only fills me with gratitude, but it shall impart to the new government the moral force without which there is no authority.

With the re-establishment of peace and order our country can arise, heal her wounds, collect her stray children, and calm her passions.

Animated with this conciliatory spirit, I have called around me men of honesty, talent, and patriotism, fully assured that, notwithstanding the differences of their political origin, they are determined to co-operate harmoniously with you in applying the constitution to the perfection of the laws, to the glory of the Republic.

The new administration in entering on business must thank its predecessor for its efforts to transmit the power intact, and to maintain public tranquillity.

The conduct of the honorable General Cavaignac has been worthy of the loyalty of his character and of that sentiment of duty which is the first qualification of the head of a State.

We have, citizen representatives, a great mission to fulfil; it is to found a republic for the interest of all, and a government just, firm, and animated with a sincere love of progress without being either reactionary or Utopian.

Let us be men of the country, not men of a party, and with the assistance of God we shall accomplish useful if not great things.

ADDRESS TO THE FRENCH LEGISLATURE

DELIVERED JANUARY 18, 1858

I HAVE not accepted the honors of the nation with the aim of acquiring an ephemeral popularity, but in hope of deserving the approbation of posterity as the founder of established order. And I declare to you to-day, notwithstanding all that has been said on the contrary, that the future perils of your country will not arise from the excessive prerogatives of the throne, but from the absence of repressive laws. Thus the last elections, despite their satisfactory results, offered in some districts a sad spectacle. Hostile parties availed themselves of that opportunity to create disturbances; and some men even avowed themselves as the enemies of our national institutions, deceived the electors by false promises, and after gaining their suffrages, rejected them with disdain. You will never allow such a scandal to occur again; and you will hereafter compel all the eligible to take the oath to the constitution before presenting themselves as candidates for office.

The tranquillizing of the public mind has been the aim of our constant efforts, and you will aid me in seeking means for reducing the factious opposition to silence. Is it not painful to witness, in a country peaceful and prosperous at home, and respected abroad, one party decrying the government to which it is indebted for the security it enjoys, while another exerts its political liberty to undermine the existing institutions?

I offer a hearty welcome to all those who recognize the national will, and I do not inquire into their antecedents.

As for those who have originated disturbances and organized the conspiracies, let them know that their time has gone by!

I cannot close without mentioning that criminal attempt which has been recently made. I thank heaven for the visible protection which it has granted to the Empress and myself; and I deeply deplore that a plan for destroying one life should have ended in the loss of so many. Yet this thwarted scheme can teach us some useful lessons. The recourse to such desperate means is but a proof of the feebleness and impotence of the conspirators. And again, there never was an assassination which served the interests of the men who armed the murderer. Neither the party that struck Cæsar, nor that which slew Henry IV, profited by their overthrow. God sometimes permits the death of the just, but he never allows the triumph of the evil agent. Thus these attempts neither disturb my security in the present nor my trust in the future. If I live, the Empire lives with me; if I fall, the Empire will be strengthened by my death, for the indignation of the people and of the army will be a new support for the throne of my son.

Let us face the future with confidence, and calmly devote ourselves to the welfare and to the honor of our country.
Dieu protège la France!

CARDINAL MANNING



HENRY EDWARD MANNING, a distinguished English Roman Catholic prelate and pulpit orator, created Cardinal in 1875, was born at Totteridge, Hertfordshire, July 15, 1808, and died at Westminster, London, Jan. 14, 1892. He was educated at Harrow, and at Balliol College, Oxford, and in his university career showed himself to be a ready and effective speaker. His first design was to enter political life, but he afterwards decided to go into the Church, and after studying theology he took orders in the Established (Anglican) Church. In 1833, he became rector of Lavington, Sussex, receiving the preferment of the archdeaconry of Chichester meanwhile (in 1840). After Ward and Newman, who had taken part with him in the Tractarian movement, had entered the Roman communion, Manning was regarded as one of the leaders of the High Church party; but the decision in the famous "Gorham Case," regarding baptism, determined him to leave the Anglican Church, and in April, 1851, he was received into the Roman fold. After several years' residence at Rome, he was appointed rector of St. Mary's, Bayswater, London, and on the death of Cardinal Wiseman (in 1865), became archbishop of Westminster. Manning was a preacher of much eloquence, a learned theologian, and an acute and skillful controversialist. Besides being foremost in most Catholic movements in England, he was active in the interest of Christian socialism and an ardent supporter of the temperance cause, writing and lecturing much in its behalf. He was untiring in philanthropic labors, and was conspicuous in educational affairs as well as in all movements for social reform. In spite of the ascetic character of his mind, he exercised a broad charity in religious matters. His chief writings include "The Unity of the Church" (1842); "Sermons at Oxford" (1844); "The Grounds of Faith" (1852); "Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects" (1863); "The Temporal Power of the Pope" (1866); "England and Christendom" (1867); "The Infallible Church" (1875); "The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance" (1875). In 1896, a "Life of Cardinal Manning," by E. S. Purcell, was published, the appearance of which, with its free comment on some incidents and periods in the distinguished prelate's career, provoked considerable discussion.

THE TRIUMPH OF THE CHURCH

"We give thanks unto God, who maketh us always to triumph in Christ Jesus, and manifesteth the odor of the knowledge of Him by us in every place. For we are a good odor of Christ unto God, both in them that are saved and in them that perish; in the one indeed an odor of life, in the other an odor of death unto death."

—2 Cor. ii, 14-16.

SUCH was the confidence of the Apostle in the face of all that was most hostile, mighty, and triumphant in the judgment of this world. He was confident that through God his mission in the world was being accomplished, that the word of God was triumphing over all the power of men. They may well have said to him, "What is this triumph you speak of? If this be triumph, what is defeat? You were stoned the other day at Lystra; you were imprisoned at Philippi; you were scourged at Jerusalem; you were saved out of the hands of the people only by Roman soldiers; you were confounded by the philosophers at Athens; and you were refuted out of the holy Scriptures by the Jews of Berea. If this is triumph, you are welcome to it." Such, no doubt, was the lordly and confident language of men in the face of the apostles of Jesus Christ then, and such is the language of confidence with which the world looks on the Catholic Church at this hour. It counts it to be a comedy played out, a stale mediæval superstition, and a name that is trampled in the earth. In every age the Church has been militant and in warfare. It is under the same law of suffering which crucified its Divine Head. His throne was a cross, and his crown was of thorns. Nevertheless he triumphed, and he triumphs still, and shall triumph to the end. And so at this moment, in this nineteenth century, in the century of modern civilization, of light, of progress, of scientific affectation, the Catholic Church is derided. They say to us, "Look at the Catholic Church in Germany; look at it in Italy; the head of the Church dethroned; and not a spot on earth for the incarnation to set its foot upon. If this be triumph you are welcome to it." Our answer is: "Yes, even now we triumph always and in every place. The Catholic Church is triumphing now in America, and in Ire-

land, and in the colonies of the British empire; aye, and in the midst of the confusions in Spain, and in France through revolution after revolution, and in the furnace of infidelity; aye, and in Germany, in the midst of all that the might of man can do against it; and in Italy too, where the head of the Church is morally a prisoner, it is triumphing even now."

But how can I verify this assertion? It would be enough indeed to quote the words of the Apostle, but I hope to do more. The world esteems the triumph of the Church to be in wealth, power, glory, honor, public sway over empires and nations. There was a time indeed when the world laid these things at the feet of the apostles of Jesus Christ. There was a time when the Catholic Church and the Christian world knew how to sanctify the society of men; but there is this difference—the world then believed, and the world now is apostate. Nevertheless, there is a triumph in the Christian world and there is a triumph in the anti-Christian world; and what is it? It is that the Church in every age and in every condition, and in the midst of all antagonists, fulfils its mission and accomplishes its work, and no power of man can hinder it. Men may, as we shall see hereafter, to their own destruction, resist the mission of the Church, but its work will be accomplished nevertheless, and accomplished even in them; and its work will be a good odor of Christ unto God both in those that are saved and in those that perish. The world has neither tests nor measures by which to understand what the mission and the work of the Church are; but they who see by the light of faith have both. Let us examine, then, what is its mission, what is its work, and how it is fulfilled.

1. First of all, the mission of the Church among men is this—to be a witness for God, and for the incarnation of God in the face of the world. Our Divine Lord said of himself:

“For this was I born, and for this came I into the world, that I should give testimony unto the truth.” As it was with him, so it is with his Church; and therefore he said to his apostles: “You shall be witnesses unto me,” and St. John said: “That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands handled, of the word of life; for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and do bear witness, and declare unto you, the life eternal which was with the Father, and hath appeared unto us; that is to say, the manifestation of God in the flesh, the incarnation of the Son of God.” The Church was the witness of this divine fact to the world, and it is witness to this hour. I may say it is an eye-witness. It was eye-witness of what it declares. It was an ear-witness of what it affirms. I may say in truth that the Church of God, which testifies at this hour, saw the Son of God, and heard his words, and was witness of his miracles. So St. Peter expressly declares, speaking of his transfiguration: “We have not, by artificial fables, made known to you the power and presence of our Lord Jesus Christ; but we were eye-witnesses of his greatness. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, this voice coming down to him from the excellent glory: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him. And this voice we heard brought from heaven, when we were with him in the holy mount.” More than this: it was a witness of the day of Pentecost, and upon it the Holy Ghost descended. It heard the sound of the mighty wind and it saw the tongues of fire. The Church therefore testifies at this day as an ear-witness and an eye-witness of the divine facts which it declares. And how can this be said? Because that which the apostles saw

and heard they delivered to others who believed in them upon a full test and knowledge of their truth, and those who received their testimony held it as a sacred trust and declared it to those who came after. From age to age the testimony of the apostles has descended unbroken. The intrinsic certainty of their witness, resting on their own eye-witness and ear-witness of the facts, has not diminished by a shade, jot, or tittle in the lapse of time, and the external evidence of that fact has multiplied and extended throughout all time and throughout the world. Therefore the testimony of the apostles to these divine realities and truths is as living and fresh at this day as it was in the beginning. Then twelve men testified; now the nations of the world, united in one body by faith and by baptism, take up and perpetuate that testimony. And part of that testimony is this—that when the Son of God ascended into heaven, as they saw him ascend, he fulfilled his promise that he would send the Spirit of Truth, the Holy Ghost, to abide with them forever; that when one Divine Teacher had gone up to his Father's throne, another should come in his stead; that the world should never be without a divine person and a divine teacher in the midst of it; and that the Spirit of Truth by which they were united to their Divine Head in heaven should unite them also to each other as his members in one mystical body, and should form to himself a dwelling-place in which to abide forever. As the soul abides in the body of the man, so the Holy Ghost abides in the body of the Church. It is the sanctuary in which he dwells; the organ by which he speaks, so that the words of our Divine Lord are fulfilled to the very letter—"He that heareth you heareth me"; for the voice of the head and that of the body, as St. Augustine says, are one and the same voice. As they make one moral person, so their

voice is identical, and the assistance of the Holy Spirit keeps the voice of the Church always in perfect harmony with the voice of its Divine Head, fulfilling the promise of the Lord by his prophet: "My spirit which is upon thee and my word which I put in thy mouth, shall never depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed from this time and forever." Thus, then, the mission of the Church is fulfilled always; whether the world believe or disbelieve, whether it gainsay or assent, it matters not; the testimony of the Church forever triumphs in every place.

2. Another part of the mission of the Church is this—to teach the doctrines of Jesus Christ in the midst of all the controversies and contradictions of men. In the face of all the errors and heresies of men there is one Divine Teacher perpetually declaring the same immutable truth. In the clamor and confusion of the human voices of philosophers and human guides, of the scribes and pharisees of the new laws, there is one Divine Voice—articulate, clear, and piercing—which cleaves through all the confusion, and is to be heard above the clamor of men and of nations—the voice of that one holy, Catholic, and Roman Church, spreading from the sunrise to the sunset, immutable in its doctrine, teaching the same truths identically in every place, and abiding always the same unchanging teacher in every age. This is a fact legible in human history. I need not offer proof of it from histories written by ourselves; it is proved by histories and controversies of those who are most opposed to us. There is an accusation which is repeated from age to age against the Catholic and Roman Church; and what is it? That it always persists in its old errors. I accept the accusation. Its persistence proves its immutability, and that which they account

error we know to be the doctrine of Jesus Christ; because, as I have already shown from the word of God, neither can the Catholic Church ever err in believing, nor can the Catholic Church err in teaching. These are two impossibilities, and they descend from one and the same divine truth. God, the Holy Ghost, abiding forever in the mystical body of Christ, illuminates the whole body of the faithful from the time of their baptism. From the time that the graces of faith, hope, and charity are infused into their souls, they are illuminated with the light of faith as the world is illuminated by the splendor of the sun at noonday; and the faithful throughout the world continue passively in their persistence in that one baptismal faith wherewith they were enlightened from their earliest consciousness. And further, they can never err in believing, because the Church which teaches them can never err in teaching. The episcopate throughout the world, which is the college of the apostles multiplied and expanded among all nations, has always the assistance of the Spirit of Truth to guide and preserve it, so that the errors of men and infirmities of our intellect never prevail over the light of faith by which the whole Episcopate of the Church is sustained in the revelation of the day of Pentecost. And more than this: nineteen general councils, from the first which declared the coequality and consubstantiality of the Son with the Father and the Holy Ghost, down to the last which declared the infallibility of the vicar of Jesus Christ,—those nineteen councils have been the organ of the Holy Ghost, preserving the truth in all ages; and the pontiffs, two hundred and fifty-seven in number, have also been guided and assisted by the same Spirit of Truth; so that no doctrine of faith and morals from their hand and from their lips has been out of harmony with the revelation of Jesus Christ. For these reasons the Church

is fulfilling its mission, always and in every place, and it can say in every age, with a divine certainty of knowledge and with a divine authority of teaching: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."

3. Once more, and lastly: there is another part of the mission of the Church which never fails, and is never baffled—and that is, that the Church judges between the truth of God and the errors of men, and gives decision with divine certainty what is truth, what is falsehood, what is light, and what is darkness. Here again the world, in the confusion of its discordant witnesses, bears testimony to our truth. The world disclaims altogether the presence of any divine teacher in the midst of us. It derides the very notion. There is not a sect or a communion, or a so-called church, which lays claim to this divine guidance. They say infallibility exists nowhere but in God. As the Pharisees said: "Who can forgive sins but God only?" thereby acknowledging the divinity of him who forgave the palsied man. And while they say: "We have no infallibility in us; we do not claim it; we deny its existence on the face of the earth," the one Teacher, who never varies in his voice, says: "He that heareth me heareth him that sent me." It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and unto us that we should claim that infallibility, and we cite you before the tribunal of God to answer for your denial of that truth. We say further that no man knows that any revelation was ever made to man except through our testimony. You never saw the Word made flesh, you nor your forefathers; and you have no unbroken succession of witnesses who trace upward these eighteen hundred years to the day when the Holy Ghost descended with wind and fire; you are not in contact with the original revelation of God. How can you rise up and say; "This was revealed upwards of

eighteen hundred years ago," when you have no proof to give, except that which you borrow from me, that the Son of God ever came into the world? You take my witness for the fact of Christianity, and you then contradict me when I teach you what the doctrines of Christianity are. And if men appeal to the Scriptures, our answer is the same. How do you know the Scriptures were ever written? How can you prove that there ever was a book called the Word of God? You had it from me; you snatched it out of my hand, and you then read it and interpret it in contradiction to my teaching. How do you know that there were four greater prophets and twelve less in the Old Testament; that there are four evangelists and fourteen epistles of St. Paul in the New? Who told you all these things? You had them all from me—from me alone, to whom these Scriptures were committed in custody and in guardianship; from me, who preserved and handed them on to this day. You, who are denying the inspiration of this book and of that, of this text and of that text, and who are gnawing away, as a moth fretteth a garment, the whole written word of God, you rise up and tell us: "This is the meaning of the holy Scriptures," and you reject the holy Catholic faith.

Dear brethren, it needs great patience to hear these things; nevertheless the judge is always calm and patient while he is fulfilling his work among men, and that because it is a grave thing to be the odor of life unto life and of death unto death to the eternal souls of men. And when men appeal to antiquity and tell us that "this is not the primitive tradition," the Church answers: Were you ever in antiquity, or any one that belongs to you? I was there, and as a perpetual witness antiquity is to me nothing but my early days. Antiquity exists in my consciousness to this hour, as men grown

to riper years remember their childhood. Men of the world know that the coterporaneous interpretation of a law is the most authentic and certain interpretation. But I have the coterporaneous interpretation of holy Scripture; and more than this, men who practise before human tribunals know that the continuous usage of a country is the interpretation of its laws written and unwritten. But I have the coterperaneous and the continuous usage of the Church of God. The seven sacraments are institutions of Jesus Christ and every one of them interprets a cluster of truths. The existence of the Church itself is an interpretation of the words: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The jurisdiction that I have over the world, which the hearts of men recognize and to which their consciences respond, is the interpretation of the words: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whosoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained."

But lastly there is another appeal which men make in this day. We are now told that scientific history is the test of truth; and I saw the other day in a document having great pretension from a certain body of men who are troubling Germany and attempting to trouble even England with the name of Old Catholics, that the way to know the pure faith of Jesus Christ is to interpret history by science. Alas, as I said before, the world is full of pretensions to science; but those who claim to be Catholics, and who yet appeal from the living voice of the Catholic Church to any other tribunal whatsoever, are all of them identical in their principle, and that principle is heresy. Luther appealed from the voice of the Catholic Church to Scripture, and thereby became a heretic. There are others who appeal to antiquity, and the

appeal is the same—it is an appeal from the living voice, from the divine authority of the Church, to something of their own choice and creation. It matters not to what the appeal is made. That which constitutes both the treason of the act and the heresy of the principle is that they appeal from the living voice, that is from the divine voice. This it is that is being done at this moment by a body of men who profess to be and to intend to live and die Catholics; and what is more, to purify and reform the Church by staying in it. What is their appeal? Their appeal is to history, to scientific history; that is, to history interpreted by themselves. Luther was much more direct and much wiser. He appealed to a book which is certainly written by the Holy Ghost; they appeal to I know not what books, but to books certainly written only by men, and not by the Spirit of God; to human history, the authenticity of which and the purity of the text of which no one can guarantee; and even this they interpret for themselves.

Now bear with me further if I dwell a few moments longer upon this. At the time I speak, in the old Catholic city of Cologne there is assembled together a number of these men—some four or five hundred—with a handful of unhappy priests, perhaps six or eight, of whom the greater part had already the note of unsoundness upon them before they took their deadly step. And what are they? What are these men who are rising up to purify the Church? What do they believe? Some believe all the Council of Trent, but not the Council of the Vatican. Some believe the Church to be infallible, but not its Head; others propose to reject the invocation of saints, and purgatory, and compulsory confession, and I know not what. Others ask for either half or altogether rationalists. And who have they to assist them?

Excommunicated Jansenists from Holland, and members, I grieve to say, of the Established Church from England; and those chosen, as it were, by a happy fatality, one the most extreme of old-fashioned high-church orthodoxy—an estimable and excellent man, whose person I both respect and love; and another whose advanced rationalism is such that even his own brethren can hardly forbear protesting against him. So that we have assembled in this congress, which is to reform and purify the Catholic and Roman Church of all ages, men so irreconcilably in contradiction with themselves that they cannot touch a religious doctrine without discord, and they cannot find anything on which to unite except in opposition to the one immutable truth. There was a day when all the Scribes, and all the Pharisees, and all the Herodians, and all the hypocrites, and all the men who could agree in anything else or at any other time, were united together in one conspiracy, and though their witnesses did not agree together and their discordant voices could not be combined they all had one will and one purpose against the Son of God and against his truth. These men, I bear witness—many of them at least—have no such intention; but we know from the Word of God that neither had they who crucified our Divine Master a knowledge of what they did: “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.” “Which none of the princes of this world knew; for if they had known it they would never have crucified the Lord of Glory.” But they are at this moment fulfilling the very words of the apostles: “And to some the testimony of the Church is life unto life, to others death unto death.”

Such, then, is the mission and the work of the Church—to bear its witness, to teach and to judge; and in doing this, whether men will believe or whether men will not believe,

it is accomplishing its triumph in the world. The world forgets that there is not only salvation, but there is also judgment; and God, the just judge of all, is putting men on their trial. The Church is fulfilling its office by proposing the way of salvation to men, visibly to the eye by its own presence, audibly to the ear by its own teachings, clearly to the intellect by the evident truth of its doctrines. It is putting men upon trial and applying the test to their hearts. It tests their faith to see whether men will believe; it tests their candor to see whether they will choose God above all things; it tests their courage to know whether they are ready to take up their cross and follow their Divine Master. The Church says to the men of this day: "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the Gospel shall save it." And in saying this God is separating between nation and nation and between man and man. His "fan is in his hand and he will thoroughly purge his floor and gather his wheat into the garner, but the chaff will he burn with unquenchable fire." "He that believeth and is baptized will be saved; but he that believeth not is condemned." "We thank God, who always maketh us to triumph in Christ Jesus and manifesteth the odor of him by us in every place;" for we now, at this hour, in the midst of this nineteenth century, in the midst of science and progress, are the odor of life unto life and the odor of death unto death. For the purpose of God in the world is this—to gather out, as he did of old, a people for his name. Among the Gentiles of the old world he chose Israel; so now amongst the nations of the new world he chooses those that believe. He knows the number of his elect and he calls them by their name. He proposes to them the way of salvation and puts all things necessary—truth and grace—within their reach.

God is putting them on trial, and the Church in this is fulfilling its mission and accomplishing its work.

The world is on its probation now. It has been for generations and generations driving God and Christianity out of its public life. Christianity is cancelled from its public law; Christianity is silent in the legislature; Christianity at this moment lingers in education, but men are endeavoring to close the doors of the schools against it and so to shut Christianity out of the knowledge of the rising generation. Woe to the people the tradition of whose Christian education is cut asunder! Woe to your children and to your posterity if they are brought up without the knowledge of Christianity! The world is laboring with all its might, and all its fraud, and all its riches, and all its public authority, to accomplish this end. I do not say that the men who are doing it know what they do; but I affirm that they are doing what I say. Unbelievers like those who created the infidel revolution of France in the last century knew well what they were doing. "Let us destroy the accursed one," was the language in which they frankly spoke of Jesus Christ. Men are more refined in the present day. They talk only of the religious difficulty. "Let us evade or get around the religious difficulty;" and, under this plea of evading the religious difficulty, Christianity is to be excluded from our schools; that is to say, because grown men choose to controvert and contradict each other as to what is the truth of God, the little ones of Jesus Christ are to be robbed of their faith. Again, the world is separating its civil powers, its public authority from the unity of the faith and of the Church everywhere. It is making it a part of high and perfect legislation, of what we hear called in these days "progress and modern civilization," to separate the Church from the State, and the school from the Church.

Progress has deposed the Head of the Church; it has put in derision a crown of thorns upon his head; and it believes that at last it has the whole world to itself.

This indeed is the triumph of the world. But meanwhile the Church is triumphing, though men know it not. The Church was never more widespread than at this moment; never more luminous in the eyes of men, never more explicitly known in its faith; never more united, vigorous, pure, and confident in its work. Its kingdom is not of this world: that is, it is not derived from it; the foundation of its jurisdiction is in eternity; the source of its truth is in the Holy Ghost, and its imperishable Head is the Son of God at the right hand of the Father. His kingdom is in the world, but not of it. The world may prosper and go its way; it may stop its ears against the voice of the Divine Witness to the truth; nevertheless that witness will be the odor of death unto death.

And England also is on its probation. I bear witness that in England errors are vanishing away, as the snow melts before the sun—passing away, as the hard frosts before the coming of the spring. The errors which were once dominant, lordly, confident, and persecuting—where are they now? At this day men are proclaiming that they are not certain of what their forefathers bequeathed to them; that they cannot precisely tell what was the doctrine which was intended in the Thirty-nine Articles, and was incorporated in statute laws. They are no longer certain of these things; and I bear them witness that a gentler spirit and a kindlier disposition is working in the hearts of many. In the midst of this darkness, truth is rising again, and the old Catholic Church and faith, for which Ireland has stood inflexible as a martyr, with the aureola upon her head, at this day is mul-

tiplying the children of faith here and throughout the world. Here too in Lancashire, where the faith of England has never been extinct—where to this day the little children of our flock are the descendants of those who were martyrs and confessors some three hundred years ago—the lingering tradition of faith once more is embodied in the perfect hierarchy of the Church of God, in its perfect order, perfect unity, perfect jurisdiction, perfect authority. And, what is more, the men of England have learned to know it better. They have heard it speak; they have seen it worship; they have even knelt together with us before the same altar, perhaps hardly knowing what they did; and that because the Spirit of God is working for his truth, and multitudes will be saved. We are only in the twilight of the morning; but we can see Jesus standing on the shore, and there is a net in the hands of his apostles let down in the water. But when we are long gone to our rest, who can say what shall be the great draught of souls which shall be miraculously taken in England?

I must bear witness that in England there are tokens full of hope. England never rejected the holy Catholic faith. A tyrannous and guilty king, a corrupt and covetous court, men full of the conceit of false learning, schemers and intriguers, men that hungered to spoil the Church for their own enrichment—these tyrannized over the people of England. The people of England held to their faith and died for it. The people of England never rejected it. They were robbed of it; they were deprived of their inheritance, and their children were born disinherited of their faith; every century from that hour to this they have gone farther and farther from the light of the one truth. Poor English people! Bear with them—I speak as an Englishman—bear with them; they

know not what they do in believing that we worship images, that we imbrued our hands in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Let the men who write these things look at their own hands; there is blood enough upon them. But the English people do not believe these things now; they are passed away. And there has come in the place of these impostures a desire after truth—"Only let me find it;" a craving after unity—"Can we never make an end of these divisions?" a thirsting for the presence of Jesus Christ upon the altar—"Where can I find him?" And what are all these aspirations? They are the evidences of the good odor of life unto life.

And now, dear brethren, in the midst of all the lordly triumph of the world, of all that which no doubt we shall hear to-morrow, be of good heart. As they said to the apostles so they will say to us: "If this be triumph, what can be defeat? We do not quarrel if you are content with these victories." Overhead there is a throne, and round about it are those whom no man can number; the powers and prerogatives of him who sits upon that throne are working mightily in the world. There is one who sits above the water-flood, with all its confusions, whose voice penetrates through all the jangling contradictions of men. He is bringing to its fulfilment the purpose which from all eternity he has predestined. He knows his own by number and by name, and he will gather them out as the shepherd gathers his flock, and he will separate the goats from the sheep. He will reign until the whole of that work is accomplished. When it is done, and when the last of his elect has been gathered in, and the last of his redeemed has been made perfect, then he will manifest himself to all men, and the world shall then know that he has triumphed always and in every place.

SERGEANT PRENTISS



ARGENT SMITH PRENTISS, an American orator and politician, was born at Portland, Me., Sept. 30, 1808, and died at Longwood, near Natchez, Miss., July 1, 1850. He was educated at Bowdoin College, studied law for a time, and after an interval spent as private tutor at Natchez, he was admitted to the Bar in 1829. He removed to Vicksburg in 1832, entered the Mississippi legislature in 1835, and three years later entered Congress. He did not engage much in the debates in the House, but on one occasion delivered a strong speech against the sub-treasury bill. He stoutly opposed the repudiation of the State debt, and, believing the State of Mississippi dishonored by its course in respect to repudiation, removed to New Orleans in 1845. There part of the last three years of his life was spent. Prentiss's forensic and other orations were greatly praised by his contemporaries, especially by Everett and Webster. One of his most famed speeches was a defence of his friend, Judge Wilkinson, who had been charged with murder. When addressing large masses of people he spoke with great impetuosity and appeared as if borne away on the stream of his own eloquence. In pleading at the Bar, he displayed perfect mastery of the subject in hand as well as great readiness and command of resource. The following address is a good exemplification of his style as an orator.

THE NEW ENGLAND ADDRESS

DELIVERED BEFORE THE NEW ENGLAND SOCIETY OF NEW ORLEANS,
DECEMBER 22, 1845

THIS is a day dear to the sons of New England, and ever held by them in sacred remembrance. On this day from every quarter of the globe they gather in spirit around the Rock of Plymouth and hang upon the urns of their Pilgrim Fathers the garlands of filial gratitude and affection.

We have assembled for the purpose of participating in this honorable duty; of performing this pious pilgrimage. To-day we will visit that memorable spot. We will gaze upon the place where a feeble band of persecuted exiles founded a mighty nation; and our hearts will exult with proud gratification as we remember that on that barren shore our an-

cestors planted not only empire but freedom. We will meditate upon their toils, their sufferings, and their virtues, and to-morrow return to our daily avocations with minds refreshed and improved by the contemplation of their high principles and noble purposes.

The human mind cannot be contented with the present. It is ever journeying through the trodden regions of the past or making adventurous excursions into the mysterious realms of the future. He who lives only in the present is but a brute, and has not attained the human dignity.

Of the future but little is known; clouds and darkness rest upon it; we yearn to become acquainted with its hidden secrets; we stretch out our arms toward its shadowy inhabitants; we invoke our posterity, but they answer us not. We wander in its dim precincts till reason becomes confused and at last start back in fear, like mariners who have entered an unknown ocean, of whose winds, tides, currents, and quicksands they are wholly ignorant.

Then it is we turn for relief to the past, that mighty reservoir of men and things. There we have something tangible to which our sympathies can attach; upon which we can lean for support; from whence we can gather knowledge and learn wisdom. There we are introduced into nature's vast laboratory and witness here elemental labors. We mark with interest the changes in continents and oceans by which she has notched the centuries.

But our attention is still more deeply aroused by the great moral events which have controlled the fortunes of those who have preceded us and still influence our own. With curious wonder we gaze down the long isles of the past upon the generations that are gone. We behold as in a magic glass men in form and feature like ourselves, actuated by the same

motives, urged by the same passions, busily engaged in shaping out both their own destinies and ours. We approach them and they refuse not our invocation. We hold converse with the wise philosophers, the sage legislators, and divine poets. We enter the tent of the general and partake of his most secret counsels. We go forth with him to the battlefield and behold him place his glittering squadrons; then we listen with a pleasing fear to the trumpet and the drum, or the still more terrible music of the booming cannon and the clashing arms. But most of all among the innumerable multitudes who peopled the past, we seek our own ancestors, drawn towards them by an irresistible sympathy.

Indeed, they were our other selves. With reverent solicitude we examine into their character and actions, and as we find them worthy or unworthy our hearts swell with pride, or our cheeks glow with shame. We search with avidity for the most trivial circumstances in their history and eagerly treasure up every memento of their fortunes. The instincts of our nature bind us indissolubly to them and link our fates with theirs. Men cannot live without a past; it is as essential to them as a future. Into its vast confines we will journey to-day and converse with our Pilgrim Fathers. We will speak to them and they shall answer us.

Two centuries and a quarter ago a little tempest-tossed, weather-beaten bark, barely escaped from the jaws of the wild Atlantic, landed upon the bleakest shore of New England. From her deck disembarked a hundred and one care-worn exiles.

To the casual observer no event could seem more insignificant. The contemptuous eye of the world scarcely deigned to notice it. Yet the famous vessel that bore Cæsar and his fortunes carried but an ignoble freight compared with that

of the "Mayflower." Her little band of Pilgrims brought with them neither wealth nor power, but the principles of civil and religious freedom. They planted them for the first time in the western Continent. They cherished, cultivated, and developed them to a full and luxuriant maturity; and then furnished them to their posterity as the only sure and permanent foundations for a free government.

Upon those foundations rests the fabric of our great republic; upon those principles depends the career of human liberty. Little did the miserable pedant and bigot who then wielded the sceptre of Great Britain imagine that from this feeble settlement of persecuted and despised Puritans in a century and a half would arise a nation capable of coping with his own mighty empire in arts and arms.

It is not my purpose to enter into the history of the Pilgrims; to recount the bitter persecutions and ignominious sufferings which drove them from England; to tell of the eleven years of peace and quiet spent in Holland under their beloved and venerated pastor; nor to describe the devoted patriotism which prompted them to plant a colony in some distant land where they could remain citizens of their native country and at the same time be removed from its oppressions; where they could enjoy liberty without violating allegiance. Neither shall I speak of the perils of their adventurous voyage; of the hardships of their early settlement; of the famine which prostrated and the pestilence which consumed them.

With all these things you are familiar, both from the page of history and from the lips of tradition. On occasions similar to this the ablest and most honored sons of New England have been accustomed to tell with touching eloquence the story of their sufferings, their fortitude, their persever-

ance, and their success. With pious care they have gathered and preserved the scattered memorials of those early days, and the names of Carver, Bradford, Winslow, Standish, and their noble companions, have long since become with us venerated household words.

There were, however, some traits that distinguished the enterprise of the Pilgrims from all others, and which are well worthy of continued remembrance. In founding their colony they sought neither wealth nor conquest, but only peace and freedom. They asked but for a region where they could make their own laws and worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

From the moment they touched the shore they labored with orderly, systematic, and persevering industry. They cultivated without a murmur, a poor and ungrateful soil, which even now yields but a stubborn obedience to the dominion of the plough. They made no search for gold nor tortured the miserable savages to wring from them the discovery of imaginary mines. Though landed by a treacherous pilot upon a barren and inhospitable coast, they sought neither richer fields nor a more genial climate. They found liberty and for the rest it mattered little. For more than eleven years they had meditated upon their enterprise, and it was no small matter could turn them from its completion. On the spot where first they rested from their wanderings with stern and high resolve, they built their little city and founded their young republic. There honesty, industry, knowledge and piety grew up together in happy union. There, in patriarchal simplicity and republican equality the Pilgrim fathers and mothers passed their honorable days, leaving to their posterity the invaluable legacy of their principles and example.

How proudly can we compare their conduct with that of the adventures of other nations who preceded them. How did the Spaniard colonize? Let Mexico, Peru, and Hispaniola answer. He followed in the train of the great discoverer like a devouring pestilence. His cry was gold! gold!! gold!!! Never in the history of the world had the *sacra fames auri*¹ exhibited itself with such fearful intensity. His imagination maddened with visions of sudden and boundless wealth, clad in mail, he leaped upon the New World an armed robber. In greedy haste he grasped the sparkling sand, then cast it down with curses when he found the glittering grains were not of gold.

Pitiless as the bloodhound by his side he plunged into the primeval forests, crossed rivers, lakes, and mountains, and penetrated to the very heart of the continent. No region, however rich in soil, delicious in climate, or luxuriant in production could tempt his stay. In vain the soft breeze of the tropics, laden with aromatic fragrance, wooed him to rest; in vain the smiling valleys, covered with spontaneous fruits and flowers, invited him to peaceful quiet. His search was still for gold; the accursed hunger could not be appeased. The simple natives gazed upon him in superstitious wonder and worshipped him as a god; and he proved to them a god, but an infernal one—terrible, cruel, and remorseless. With bloody hands he tore the ornaments from their persons and the shrines from their altars; he tortured them to discover hidden treasure, and slew them that he might search, even in their wretched throats, for concealed gold. Well might the miserable Indians imagine that a race of evil deities had come among them, more bloody and relentless than those who presided over their own sanguinary rites.

¹Cursed thirst for gold.

Now let us turn to the Pilgrims. They too were tempted; and had they yielded to the temptation how different might have been the destinies of this continent—how different must have been our own! Previous to their undertaking the Old World was filled with strange and wonderful accounts of the new. The unbounded wealth, drawn by the Spaniards from Mexico and South America, seemed to afford rational support for the wildest assertions. Each succeeding adventurer returning from his voyage added to the Arabian tales a still more extravagant story.

At length Sir Walter Raleigh, the most accomplished and distinguished of all those bold voyagers, announced to the world his discovery of the province of Guiana and its magnificent capital, the far-famed city of El Dorado. We smile now at his account of the "great and golden city," and "the mighty, rich, and beautiful empire." We can hardly imagine that any one could have believed for a moment in their existence. At that day, however, the whole matter was received with the most implicit faith. Sir Walter professed to have explored the country, and thus glowingly describes it from his own observation:

"I never saw a more beautiful country nor more lively prospects; hills so raised here and there over the valleys—the river winding into divers branches—the plains adjoining, without bush or stubble—all fair green grass—the deer crossing in every path—the birds, towards the evening, singing on every tree with a thousand several tunes—the air fresh, with a gentle easterly wind: and every stone that we stopped to take up promised either gold or silver by its complexion. For health, good air, pleasure, and riches, I am resolved it cannot be equalled by any region either in the east or west."

The Pilgrims were urged in leaving Holland to seek this charming country and plant their colony among its Arcadian

bowers. Well might the poor wanderers cast a longing glance towards its happy valleys, which seemed to invite to pious contemplation and peaceful labor. Well might the green grass, the pleasant groves, the tame deer, and the singing birds allure them to that smiling land beneath the equinoctial line. But while they doubted not the existence of this wondrous region they resisted its tempting charms. They had resolved to vindicate at the same time their patriotism and their principles—to add dominion to their native land, and to demonstrate to the world the practicability of civil and religious liberty. After full discussion and mature deliberation they determined that their great objects could be best accomplished by a settlement on some portion of the northern continent, which would hold out no temptation to cupidity—no inducement to persecution. Putting aside, then, all considerations of wealth and ease they addressed themselves with high resolution to the accomplishment of their noble purpose. In the language of the historian, “trusting to God and themselves,” they embarked upon their perilous enterprise.

As I said before, I shall not accompany them on their adventurous voyage. On the 22d day of December, 1620, according to our present computation, their footsteps pressed the famous rock which has ever since remained sacred to their venerated memory. Poets, painters, and orators have tasked their powers to do justice to this great scene. Indeed, it is full of moral grandeur; nothing can be more beautiful, more pathetic, or more sublime

Behold the Pilgrims as they stood on that cold December day—stern men, gentle women, and feeble children—all uniting in singing a hymn of cheerful thanksgiving to the good God who had conducted them safely across the mighty deep, and permitted them to land upon that sterile shore. See how

their upturned faces glow with a pious confidence which the sharp winter winds cannot chill, nor the gloomy forest shadows darken:

“Not as the conqueror comes,
They, the true-hearted came;
Not with the roll of the stirring drums,
Or the trumpet that sings of fame;
Not as the flying come,
In silence and in fear—
They shook the depths of the desert gloom
With their hymns of lofty cheer.”

Noble and pious band! your holy confidence was not in vain: your “hymns of lofty cheer” find echo still in the hearts of grateful millions. Your descendants, when pressed by adversity, or when addressing themselves to some high action, turn to the “Landing of the Pilgrims,” and find heart for any fate—strength for any enterprise.

How simple, yet how instructive, are the annals of this little settlement. In the cabin of the “Mayflower” they settled a general form of government, upon the principles of a pure democracy. In 1636 they published a declaration of rights and established a body of laws. The first fundamental article was in these words: “That no act, imposition, law or ordinance be made, or imposed upon us, at present or to come, but such as has been or shall be enacted by the consent of the body of freemen or associates, or their representatives legally assembled,” etc.

Here we find advanced the whole principle of the Revolution—the whole doctrine of our republican institutions. Our fathers, a hundred years before the Revolution, tested successfully, as far as they were concerned, the principle of self-government, and solved the problem whether law and order can co-exist with liberty. But let us not forget that they were wise and good men who made the noble experiment, and

that it may yet fail in our hands unless we imitate their patriotism and virtues.

There are some who find fault with the character of the Pilgrims—who love not the simplicity of their manners nor the austerity of their lives. They were men and of course imperfect; but the world may well be challenged to point out in the whole course of history men of purer purpose or braver action—men who have exercised a more beneficial influence upon the destinies of the human race, or left behind them more enduring memorials of their existence.

At all events it is not for the sons of New England to search for the faults of their ancestors. We gaze with profound veneration upon their awful shades; we feel a grateful pride in the country they colonized, in the institutions they founded, in the example they bequeathed. We exult in our birthplace and in our lineage.

Who would not rather be of the Pilgrim stock than claim descent from the proudest Norman that ever planted his robber blood in the halls of the Saxon, or the noblest paladin that quaffed wine at the table of Charlemagne? Well may we be proud of our native land, and turn with fond affection to its rocky shores.

The spirit of the Pilgrims still pervades it, and directs its fortunes. Behold the thousand temples of the Most High that nestle in its happy valleys and crown its swelling hills. See how their glittering spires pierce the blue sky, and seem like so many celestial conductors, ready to avert the lightning of an angry heaven. The piety of the Pilgrim patriarchs is not yet extinct, nor have the sons forgotten the God of their fathers.

Behold yon simple building near the crossing of the village road! It is small and of rude construction, but stands

in a pleasant and quiet spot. A magnificent old elm spreads its broad arms above and seems to lean towards it, as a strong man bends to shelter and protect a child. A brook runs through the meadow near, and hard by there is an orchard—but the trees have suffered much and bear no fruit except upon the most remote and inaccessible branches. From within its walls comes a busy hum, such as you may hear in a disturbed bee-hive.

Now peep through yonder window and you will see a hundred children with rosy cheeks, mischievous eyes, and demure faces, all engaged or pretending to be so, in their little lessons. It is the public school—the free, the common school—provided by law: open to all: claimed from the community as a right, not accepted as a bounty.

Here the children of the rich and poor, high and low, meet upon perfect equality and commence under the same auspices the race of life. Here the sustenance of the mind is served up to all alike, as the Spartans served their food upon the public table. Here young Ambition climbs his little ladder, and boyish Genius plumes his half-fledged wing. From among these laughing children will go forth the men who are to control the destinies of their age and country; the statesman whose wisdom is to guide the Senate—the poet who will take captive the hearts of the people and bind them together with immortal song—the philosopher who, boldly seizing upon the elements themselves, will compel them to his wishes and through new combinations of their primal laws, by some great discovery revolutionize both art and science.

The common village school is New England's fairest boast—the brightest jewel that adorns her brow. The principle that society is bound to provide for its members' education as well as protection, so that none need be ignorant

except from choice, is the most important that belongs to modern philosophy. It is essential to a republican government. Universal education is not only the best and surest, but the only sure foundation for free institutions. True liberty is the child of knowledge; she pines away and dies in the arms of ignorance.

Honor, then, to the early fathers of New England, from whom came the spirit which has built a schoolhouse by every sparkling fountain and bids all come as freely to the one as to the other. All honor, too, to this noble city, who has not disdained to follow the example of her northern sisters, but has wisely determined that the intellectual thirst of her children deserves as much attention as their physical, and that it is as much her duty to provide the means of assuaging the one as of quenching the other.

But the spirit of the Pilgrims survives, not only in the knowledge and piety of their sons, but most of all in their indefatigable enterprise and indomitable perseverance.

They have wrestled with nature till they have prevailed against her and compelled her reluctantly to reverse her own laws. The sterile soil has become productive under their sagacious culture, and the barren rock, astonished, finds itself covered with luxuriant and unaccustomed verdure.

Upon the banks of every river they build temples to industry and stop the squanderings of the spendthrift waters. They bind the naiades of the brawling stream. They drive the dryades from their accustomed haunts and force them to desert each favorite grove; for upon river, creek, and bay they are busy transforming the crude forest into stanch and gallant vessels. From every inlet or indenture along the rocky shore swim forth these ocean birds—born in the wild-wood, fledged upon the wave. Behold how they spread

their white pinions to the favoring breeze, and wing their flight to every quarter of the globe—the carrier-pigeons of the world!

It is upon the unstable element the sons of New England have achieved their greatest triumphs. Their adventurous prowls vex the waters of every sea. Bold and restless as the old northern vikings, they go forth to seek their fortunes in the mighty deep. The ocean is their pasture and over its wide prairies they follow the monstrous herds that feed upon its azure fields. As the hunter casts his lasso upon the wild horse, so they throw their lines upon the tumbling whale. They “draw out Leviathan with a hook.” They “fill his skin with barbed irons,” and in spite of his terrible strength they “part him among the merchants.” To them there are no pillars of Hercules. They seek with avidity new regions, and fear not to be “the first that ever burst” into unknown seas. Had they been the companions of Columbus, the great mariner would not have been urged to return, though he had sailed westward to his dying day.

Glorious New England! thou art still true to thy ancient fame and worthy of thy ancestral honors. We, thy children, have assembled in this far-distant land to celebrate thy birthday. A thousand fond associations throng upon us, roused by the spirit of the hour. On thy pleasant valleys rest, like sweet dews of morning, the gentle recollections of our early life; around thy hills and mountains cling, like gathering mists, the mighty memories of the Revolution; and far away in the horizon of thy past gleam, like thine own Northern Lights, the awful virtues of our Pilgrim sires! But while we devote this day to the remembrance of our native land, we forget not that in which our happy lot is cast. We exult in the reflection that though we count by thousands the miles

which separate us from our birthplace, still our country is the same. We are no exiles meeting upon the banks of a foreign river to swell its waters with our homesick tears, Here floats the same banner which rustled above our boyish heads, except that its mighty folds are wider and its glittering stars increased in number.

The sons of New England are found in every State of the broad Republic. In the East, the South, and the unbounded West, their blood mingles freely with every kindred current. We have but changed our chamber in the paternal mansion; in all its rooms we are at home, and all who inhabit it are our brothers. To us the Union has but one domestic hearth; its household gods are all the same. Upon us then peculiarly devolves the duty of feeding the fires upon that kindly hearth; of guarding with pious care those sacred household gods.

We cannot do with less than the whole Union; to us it admits of no division. In the veins of our children flows northern and southern blood; how shall it be separated; who shall put asunder the best affections of the heart, the noblest instincts of our nature? We love the land of our adoption, so do we that of our birth. Let us ever be true to both; and always exert ourselves in maintaining the unity of our country, the integrity of the Republic.

Accursed, then, be the hand put forth to loosen the golden cord of Union; thrice accursed the traitorous lips, whether of northern fanatic or southern demagogue, which shall propose its severance. But no! the Union cannot be dissolved; its fortunes are too brilliant to be marred; its destinies too powerful to be resisted. Here will be their greatest triumph, their most mighty development. And when, a century hence, this crescent city shall have filled her golden horns;

when, within her broad-armed port shall be gathered the products of the industry of a hundred millions of freemen; when galleries of art and halls of learning shall have made classic this mart of trade; then may the sons of the Pilgrims, still wandering from the bleak hills of the north, stand upon the banks of the great river, and exclaim with mingled pride and wonder, Lo! this is our country; when did the world ever witness so rich and magnificent a city—so great and glorious a Republic!

ANDREW JOHNSON



ANDREW JOHNSON, seventeenth President of the United States, was born at Raleigh, N. C., Dec. 29, 1808, and died in Carter Co., Tenn., July 31, 1875. His father was drowned when young Andrew was only four years of age; he was apprenticed to a tailor, and removing to Greenville, Tenn., in 1826, worked there at his trade. His education had hitherto been of the most meagre description, but he possessed great natural aptitude, and on his marriage, some years later, he studied and read under the direction of his wife, who had been well educated. After holding several local offices he entered the State legislature, in 1835, and six years later was called to the State senate. He sat in Congress in the years 1843-53, and was subsequently governor of Tennessee. Being by nature a political leader, he was returned to Congress as senator in 1857, at this period actively opposing the Pacific Railroad Bill, and as strenuously advocating retrenchment and the Homestead Bill. At the outbreak of the Civil War he strove, often at great personal risk, to keep Tennessee within the Union, and in 1862 was appointed its military governor. He was elected to the Vice-presidency in 1864, and on the assassination of Lincoln succeeded him in the Presidential chair, April 15, 1865. His unyielding attitude on the reconstruction policy, which he favored, soon resulted in his estrangement from the Republican Congress, and its course in opposition was characterized by him, in a notable speech, "a new rebellion." The struggle between Congress and the President continued until Feb. 24, 1868, when the House of Representatives voted to impeach him for "high crimes and misdemeanors," and on the following fifth of March, presented eleven articles of impeachment, based on his resistance to the Congressional acts. The trial opened March 23, and ended May 26, with the President's acquittal, one vote of the two-thirds necessary for conviction being lacking. After the expiration of his Presidential term, Johnson was twice an unsuccessful aspirant to the Senate, but was elected in 1875 and sat in the extra session in March of that year. Johnson was a man of undoubted ability who triumphed over many obstacles in his early career, but was narrow and obstinate in not a few of his opinions. He possessed courage, however, and his honesty was unimpeachable. His life has been written by Savage in 1865, and by Foster in 1866.

SPEECH AT ST. LOUIS

OFFERED IN EVIDENCE BY THE PROSECUTION AT HIS TRIAL.
DELIVERED AT ST. LOUIS, SEPTEMBER 9, 1866

FELLOW CITIZENS OF ST. LOUIS,—In being introduced to you to-night, it is not for the purpose of making a speech. It is true I am proud to meet so many of my fellow citizens here on this occasion and under

(364)

the favorable circumstances that I do. [Cry: "How about British subjects?"] We will attend to John Bull after a while, so far as that is concerned. [Laughter and loud cheers.] I have just stated that I am not here for the purpose of making a speech, but, after being introduced, simply to tender my cordial thanks for the welcome you have given me in your midst. [A voice: "Ten thousand welcomes!" hurrahs and cheers.]

Thank you, sir; I wish it were in my power to address you under favorable circumstances upon some of the questions that agitate and distract the public mind at this time. Questions that have grown out of a fiery ordeal we have just passed through and which I think as important as those we have just passed by. The time has come when it seems to me that all ought to be prepared for peace—the rebellion being suppressed, and the shedding of blood being stopped, the sacrifice of life being suspended and stayed, it seems that the time has arrived when we should have peace; when the bleeding arteries should be tied up. [A voice: "New Orleans; go on!"]

Perhaps, if you had a word or two on the subject of New Orleans you might understand more about it than you do. [Laughter and cheers.] And if you will go back—[Cries for Seward]—if you will go back and ascertain the cause of the riot at New Orleans, perhaps you would not be so prompt in calling out New Orleans. If you will take up the riot at New Orleans and trace it back to its source, or to its immediate cause, you will find out who was responsible for the blood that was shed there.

If you will take up the riot at New Orleans and trace it back to the Radical Congress [Great cheering and cries of "Bully!"], you will find that the riot at New Orleans was

substantially planned—if you will take up the proceedings in their caucuses you will understand that they there knew [Cheers] that a convention was to be called which was extinct by its powers having expired; that it was said and the intention was that a new government was to be organized; and in the organization of that government the intention was to enfranchise one portion of the population called the colored population, who had just been emancipated, and at the same time disfranchise white men. [Great cheering.] When you begin to talk about New Orleans [Confusion] you ought to understand what you are talking about.

When you read the speeches that were made or take up the facts,—on Friday and Saturday before that convention sat,—you will there find that speeches were made incendiary in their character, exciting that portion of the population, the black population, to arm themselves and prepare for the shedding of blood. [A voice: “That’s so!” and cheers.] You will also find that that convention did assemble in violation of law, and the intent of that convention was to supersede the recognized authorities in the State government of Louisiana, which had been recognized by the government of the United States, and every man engaged in that rebellion—in that convention, with the intention of superseding and upturning the civil government which had been recognized by the government of the United States—I say that he was a traitor to the constitution of the United States [Cheers], and hence you find that another rebellion was commenced, having its origin in the Radical Congress.

These men were to go there; a government was to be organized, and the one in existence in Louisiana was to be superseded, set aside, and overthrown. You talk to me about New Orleans!

And then the question was to come up, when they had established their government,—a question of political power,—which of the two governments was to be recognized—a new government inaugurated under this defunct convention, set up in violation of law and without the consent of the people. And then when they had established their government, and extended universal or impartial franchise, as they called it, to this colored population, then this Radical Congress was to determine that a government established on negro votes was to be the government of Louisiana. [Voices: “Never,” and cheers and “Hurrah for Andy!”]

So much for the New Orleans riot—and there was the cause and the origin of the blood that was shed, and every drop of blood that was shed is upon their skirts, and they are responsible for it. [Cheers.] I could trace this thing a little closer, but I will not do it here to-night. But when you talk about New Orleans and talk about the causes and consequences that resulted from proceedings of that kind, perhaps, as I have been introduced here, and you have provoked questions of this kind, though it doesn't provoke me, I will tell you a few wholesome things that have been done by this Radical Congress. [Cheers.]

In connection with New Orleans and the extension of the elective franchise, I know that I have been traduced and abused. I know it has come in advance of me here as it has elsewhere, that I have attempted to exercise an arbitrary power in resisting laws that were intended to be enforced on the government. [Cheers and cries of “Hear!”]

Yes, that I had exercised the veto power [“Bully for you!”], that I had abandoned the power that elected me, and that I was a t-r-a-i-t-o-r [Cheers] because I exercised the veto power in attempting to, and did arrest for a time, a bill

that was called a Freedman's Bureau Bill. [Cheers.] Yes, that I was a t-r-a-i-t-o-r! And I have been traduced, I have been slandered, I have been maligned, I have been called Judas—Judas Iscariot, and all that. Now, my countrymen here to-night, it is very easy to indulge in epithets, it is very easy to call a man Judas and cry out t-r-a-i-t-o-r, but when he is called upon to give arguments and facts he is very often found wanting.

Judas, Judas Iscariot, Judas! There was a Judas once, one of the twelve apostles. Oh, yes! and these twelve apostles had a Christ. [A voice: "And a Moses, too!" Great laughter.] The twelve apostles had a Christ, and he could not have had a Judas unless he had had twelve apostles. If I had played the Judas, who has been my Christ that I have played the Judas with? Was it Thad. Stevens? Was it Wendell Phillips? Was it Charles Sumner? [Hisses and cheers.] Are these the men that set up and compare themselves with the Saviour of Man, and everybody that differs with them in opinion and tries to stay and arrest their diabolical and nefarious policy is to be denounced as a Judas? ["Hurrah for Andy!" and cheers.]

In the days when there were twelve apostles, and when there was a Christ, while there were Judases, there were unbelievers, too. Y-a-s; while there were Judases there were unbelievers. [Voices: "Hear!" "Three groans for Fletcher."] Yes, oh yes! unbelievers in Christ: men who persecuted and slandered and brought him before Pontius Pilate and preferred charges and condemned and put him to death on the cross to satisfy unbelievers. And this same persecuting, diabolical, and nefarious clan to-day would persecute and shed the blood of innocent men to carry out their purposes. [Cheers.]

But let me tell you, let me give you a few words here to-night—and but a short time since I heard some one say in the crowd that we had a Moses. [Laughter and cheers.] Yes, there was a Moses. And I know sometimes it has been said that I would be the Moses of the colored man. [“Never!” and cheers.]

Why, I have labored as much in the cause of emancipation as any other mortal man living. But while I have strived to emancipate the colored man I have felt and now feel that I have a great many white men that want emancipation. [Laughter and cheers.]

There are a set amongst you that have got shackles on their limbs and are as much under the heel and control of their masters as the colored man that was emancipated. [Cheers.]

I call upon you here to-night as freemen—as men who favor the emancipation of the white man as well as the colored ones. I have been in favor of emancipation, I have done nothing to disguise about that—I have tried to do as much and have done as much, and when they talk about Moses and the colored man being led into the promised Land, where is the land that this clan proposes to lead them? [Cheers.]

When we talk about taking them out from among the white population and sending them to other climes, what is it they propose? Why it is to give us a Freedman's Bureau. And after giving us a Freedman's Bureau what then? Why, here in the South it is not necessary for me to talk to you, where I have lived and you have lived, and understand the whole system, and how it operates; we know how the slaves have been worked heretofore.

Their original owners bought the land and raised the negroes or purchased them, as the case might be; paid all the

expenses of carrying on the farm and in the end, after producing tobacco, cotton, hemp, and flax, and all the various products of the South, bringing them into the market without any profit to them, while these owners put it all into their own pockets. This was their condition before the emancipation. This was their condition before we became their "Moses." [Cheers and laughter.]

Now what is the plan? I ask your attention. Come; as we have got to talking on this subject, give me your attention for a few minutes. I am addressing myself to your brains and not to your prejudices; to your reason and not to your passions. And when reason and argument again resume their empire this mist, this prejudice that has been incrustated upon the public mind must give way and the reason become triumphant. [Cheers.]

Now, my countrymen, let me call your attention to a single fact, the Freedman's Bureau. [Laughter and hisses.]

Yes, slavery was an accursed institution till emancipation took place. It was an accursed institution while one set of men worked them and got the profits. But after emancipation took place they gave us the Freedman's Bureau. They gave us these agents to go into every county, every township, and into every school district throughout the United States, and especially the southern States. They gave us commissioners. They gave us \$12,000,000, and placed the power in the hands of the Executive, who was to work this machinery with the army brought to its aid and to sustain it.

Then let us run it on the \$12,000,000 as a beginning, and in the end receive \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000, as the case may be, and let us work the four millions of slaves. In fine, the Freedman's Bureau was a simple proposition to transfer

four millions of slaves in the United States from their original owners to a new set of taskmasters. [Voice: "Never," and cheers.]

I have been laboring four years to emancipate them; and then I was opposed to seeing them transferred to a new set of taskmasters, to be worked with more rigor than they had been heretofore. [Cheers.]

Yes, under this new system they would work the slaves and call on the government to bear all the expense, and if there were any profits left, why they would pocket them [Laughter and cheers], while you, the people, must pay the expense of running the machine out of your pockets, and they get the profits of it. So much for this question.

I simply intended to-night to tender you my sincere thanks; but as I go along, as we are talking about this Congress and these respected gentlemen, who contend that the President is wrong, because he vetoed the Freedman's Bureau Bill, and all this; because he chose to exercise the veto power he committed a high offence, and therefore ought to be impeached. [Voice: "Never!"]

Y-a-s, y-a-s, they are ready to impeach him. [Voice: "Let them try it!"] And if they were satisfied they had the next Congress by as decided a majority as this, upon some pretext or other—violating the constitution, neglect of duty, or omitting to enforce some act of law, some pretext or other—they would vacate the executive department of the United States. [A voice: "Too bad they don't impeach him."] Wha-t? As we talk about this Congress let me call the soldiers' attention to this immaculate Congress. Let me call your attention. Oh! this Congress, that could make war upon the Executive because he stands upon the constitution

and vindicates the rights of the people, exercising the veto power in their behalf—because he dared to do this they can clamor and talk about impeachment.

And by way of elevating themselves and increasing confidence with the soldiers throughout the country, they talk about impeachment.

So far as the Fenians are concerned. Upon this subject of Fenians, let me ask you very plainly here to-night to go back into my history of legislation, and even when governor of a State, let me ask if there is a man here to-night who, in the dark days of Know-Nothingism, stood and sacrificed more for their rights? [Voice: "Good!" and cheers.]

It has been my peculiar misfortune always to have fierce opposition because I have always struck my blows direct and fought with right and the constitution on my side. [Cheers.] Yes, I will come back to the soldiers again in a moment. Yes, here was a neutrality law. I was sworn to support the constitution and see that that law was faithfully executed.

And because it was executed, then they raised a clamor and tried to make an appeal to the foreigners, and especially the Fenians. And what did they do? They introduced a bill to tickle and play with the fancy, pretending to repeal the law and at the same time making it worse, and then left the law just where it is. [Voice: "That's so!"]

They knew that whenever a law was presented to me proper in its provisions, ameliorating and softening the rigors of the present law, that it would meet my hearty approbation; but, as they were pretty well broken down and losing public confidence, at the heels of the session they found they must do something. And, hence, what did they do? They pretended to do something for the soldiers, Who has done more

for the soldiers than I have? Who has perilled more in this struggle than I have? [Cheers.]

But then, to make them their peculiar friends and favorites of the soldiers, they came forward with a proposition to do what? Why, we will give the soldier fifty dollars bounty—fifty dollars bounty, your attention to this—if he has served two years, and one hundred dollars if he has served three years.

Now, mark you, the colored man that served two years can get his one hundred dollars bounty. But the white man must serve three before he can get his. [Cheers.] But that is not the point. While they were tickling and attempting to please the soldiers by giving them fifty dollars bounty for two years' service, they took it into their heads to vote somebody else a bounty [Laughter], and they voted themselves not fifty dollars for two years' service; your attention—I want to make a lodgment in your minds of the facts, because I want to put the nail in, and having put it in I want to clinch it on the other side. [Cheers.]

The brave boy, the patriotic young man who followed his gallant officers, slept on the tented field, and perilled his life, and shed his blood, and left his limbs behind him, and came home mangled and maimed, can get fifty dollars bounty if he has served two years. But the members of Congress, who never smelt gunpowder, can get four thousand dollars extra pay. [Loud cheering.]

This is a faint picture, my countrymen, of what has transpired. [A voice: "Stick to that question."] Fellow citizens, you are all familiar with the work of restoration. You know since the rebellion collapsed, since the armies were suppressed on the field, that everything that could be done has been done by the executive department of the government for the restoration of the government.

Everything has been done with the exception of one thing; and that is the admission of members from the eleven States that went into the rebellion. And after having accepted the terms of the government, having abolished slavery, having repudiated their debt, and sent loyal representatives, everything has been done excepting the admission of representatives which all the States are constitutionally entitled to. [Cheers.]

When you turn and examine the constitution of the United States you will find that you cannot even amend that constitution so as to deprive any State of its equal suffrage in the Senate. [A voice: "They have never been out."] It is said before me: "They have never been out." I say so too, and they cannot go out. [Cheers.]

That being the fact, under the constitution they are entitled to equal suffrage in the Senate of the United States, and no power has the right to deprive them of it without violating the constitution. [Cheers.] And the same argument applies to the House of Representatives.

How, then, does the matter stand? It used to be one of the arguments, that if the States withdrew their representatives and senators that that was secession—a peaceable breaking up of the government. Now, the radical power in this government turn around and assume that the States are out of the Union, that they are not entitled to representation in Congress. [Cheers.]

That is to say, they are dissolutionists, and their position now is to perpetuate a disruption of the government; and that, too, while they are denying the States the right of representation they impose taxation upon them, a principle upon which, in the Revolution, you resisted the power of Great Britain. We deny the right of taxation without representa-

tion. That is one of our great principles. Let the government be restored. I have labored for it. Now I deny this doctrine of secession, come from what quarter it may, whether from the North or from the South. I am opposed to it. I am for the union of the States. [Voices: "That's right," and cheers.] I am for thirty-six States remaining where they are, under the constitution as your fathers made it and handed it down to you. And if it is altered or amended, let it be done in the mode and manner pointed by that instrument itself and in no other. [Cheers.]

I am for the restoration of peace. Let me ask this people here to-night if we have not shed enough blood. Let me ask: Are you prepared to go into another civil war? Let me ask this people here to-night are they prepared to set man upon man, and in the name of God, lift his hand against the throat of his fellow. [Voice: "Never!"] Are you prepared to see our fields laid waste again, our business and commerce suspended, and all trade stopped? Are you prepared to see this land again drenched in our brothers' blood? Heaven avert it, is my prayer. [Cheers.]

I am one of those who believe that man does sin, and, having sinned, I believe he must repent. And, sometimes, having sinned and having repented makes him a better man than he was before. [Cheers.] I know it has been said that I have exercised the pardoning power. Y-a-s, I have. [Cheers and "What about Drake's constitution?"] Y-a-s, I have, and don't you think it is to prevail? I reckon I have pardoned more men, turned more men loose and set them at liberty that were imprisoned, I imagine, than any other man on God's habitable globe. [Voice: "Bully for you!" and cheers.]

Yes, I turned forty-seven thousand of our men who en-

gaged in this struggle, with the arms they captured with them, and who were then in prison, I turned them loose. [Voice: "Bully for you, old fellow!" and laughter.]

Large numbers have applied for pardon and I have granted them pardon. Yet there are some who condemn and hold me responsible for so doing wrong. Yes, there are some who stayed at home, who did not go into the field on the other side, that can talk about others being traitors and being treacherous. There are some who can talk about blood and vengeance and crime and everything to "make treason odious," and all that, who never smelt gunpowder on either side. [Cheers.]

Yes, they can condemn others and recommend hanging and torture, and all that. If I have erred I have erred on the side of mercy. Some of these croakers have dared to assume that they are better than was the Saviour of men himself,—a kind of over-righteousness,—better than everybody else and always wanting to do Deity's work, thinking he cannot do it as well as they can. [Laughter and cheers.]

Yes, the Saviour of men came on the earth and found the human race condemned and sentenced under the law, but when they repented and believed he said: "Let them live." Instead of executing and putting the world to death he went upon the cross and there was painfully nailed by these unbelievers that I have spoken of here to-night, and there shed his blood that you and I might live. [Cheers.] Think of it! To execute and hang and put to death eight millions of people. [Voices: "Never!"]

It is an absurdity; and such a thing is impracticable even if it were right. But it is the violation of all law, human and divine. [A voice: "Hang Jeff. Davis!"] You call on Judge Chase to hang Jeff. Davis, will you? [Great cheer-

ing.] I am not the court, I am not the jury, nor the judge. [Voice: "Nor the Moses!"] Before the case comes to me, and all other cases, it would have to come on application as a case for pardon. That is the only way the case can get to me. Why don't Judge Chase—Judge Chase, the chief justice of the United States, in whose district he is—why don't he try him? [Loud cheers.]

But perhaps I could answer the question; as sometimes persons want to be facetious and indulge in repartee, I might ask you a question: Why don't you hang Thad. Stevens and Wendell Phillips? [Great cheering.] A traitor at one end of the line is as bad as a traitor at the other.

I know that there are some who have got their little pieces and sayings to repeat on public occasions, like parrots, that have been placed in their mouths by their superiors, who have not the courage and the manhood to come forward and tell them themselves, but have their understrappers to do their work for them. [Cheers.] I know there are some who talk about this universal elective franchise upon which they wanted to upturn the government of Louisiana and institute another; who contended that we must send men there to control, govern, and manage their slave population because they are incompetent to do it themselves. And yet they turn round when they get there and say they are competent to go to Congress and manage the affairs of State. [Cheers.]

Before you commence throwing your stones you ought to be sure you don't live in a glass house. Then why all this clamor! Don't you see, my countrymen, it is a question of power, and being in power as they are, their object is to perpetuate their power? Hence, when you talk about turning any of them out of office, oh, they talk about "bread and butter." [Laughter.]

Yes these men are the most perfect and complete "bread-and-butter party" that has ever appeared in this government. [Great cheering.] When you make an effort or struggle to take the nipple out of their mouths how they clamor! They have stayed at home here five or six years, held the offices, grown fat, and enjoyed all the emoluments of position; and now when you talk about turning one of them out, "Oh, it is proscription"; and hence they come forward and propose in Congress to do what? To pass laws to prevent the Executive from turning anybody out. [Voice: "Put 'em out!"] Hence, don't you see what the policy was to be? I believe in the good old doctrine advocated by Washington, Jefferson, and Madison, of rotation in office.

These people who have been enjoying these offices seem to have lost sight of this doctrine. I believe that when one set of men have enjoyed the emoluments of office long enough they should let another portion of the people have a chance. [Cheers.] How are these men to be got out [Voice: "Kick 'em out!"] Cheers and laughter], unless your Executive can put them out, unless you can reach them through the President?

Congress says he shall not turn them out, and they are trying to pass laws to prevent it being done. Well, let me say to you, if you will stand by me in this action [Cheers], if you will stand by me in trying to give the people a fair chance, soldiers and citizens, to participate in those offices, God being willing, I will "kick them out" just as fast as I can. [Great cheering.]

Let me say to you in concluding what I have said, and I intended to say but little, but was provoked into this, rather than otherwise, I care not for the menaces, the taunts, and jeers; I care not for the threats; I do not intend to be bullied

by my enemies nor overawed by my friends [cheers], but, God willing, with your help I will veto their measures whenever they come to me. [Cheers.]

I place myself upon the ramparts of the constitution, and when I see the enemy approaching, so long as I have eyes to see or ears to hear, or a tongue to sound the alarm, so help me God, I will do it and call upon the people to be my judges. [Cheers.] I tell you here to-night that the constitution of the country is being encroached upon. I tell you here to-night that the citadel of liberty is being endangered. [A voice: "Go it, Andy!"]

I say to you then, go to work; take the constitution as your palladium of civil and religious liberty; take it as your chief ark of safety. Just let me ask you here to-night to cling to the constitution in this great struggle for freedom, and for its preservation, as the shipwrecked mariner clings to the mast when the midnight tempest closes around him. [Cheers.]


So far as my public life has been advanced, the people of Missouri as well as of other States know that my efforts have been devoted in that direction which would ameliorate and elevate the interests of the great mass of the people. [Voice: "That's so."]

Why, where's the speech, where's the vote to be got of mine, but what has always had a tendency to elevate the great working classes of the people? [Cheers.] When they talk about tyranny and despotism, where's one act of Andrew Johnson that ever encroached upon the rights of a freeman in this land? But because I have stood as a faithful sentinel upon the watch tower of freedom to sound the alarm, hence all this traduction and detraction that has been heaped upon me. ["Bully for Andy Johnson!"]

I now, then, in conclusion, my countrymen, hand over to

you the flag of your country with thirty-six stars upon it. I hand over to you your constitution with the charge and responsibility of preserving it intact. I hand over to you tonight the Union of these States, the great magic circle which embraces them all. I hand them all over to you, the people in whom I have always trusted in all great emergencies,—questions which are of such vital interest,—I hand them over to you as men who can rise above party, who can stand around the altar of a common country with their faces upturned to heaven, swearing by him that lives for ever and ever that the altar and all shall sink in the dust, but that the constitution and the Union shall be preserved. Let us stand by the Union of these States, let us fight enemies of the government, come from what quarter they may. My stand has been taken.

You understand what my position is, and in parting with you now I leave the government in your hands with the confidence I have always had that the people will ultimately redress all wrongs and set the government right. Then, gentlemen, in conclusion, I thank you for the cordial welcome you have given me in this great city of the northwest, whose destiny no one can foretell. Now [Voice: "Three cheers for Johnson!"] then, in bidding you good-night, I leave all in your charge, and thank you for the cordial welcome you have given me in this spontaneous outpouring of the people of your city.



OLIVER W. HOLMES

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES



OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, an eminent American physician, writer in prose and verse, wit, and novelist, was born at Cambridge, Mass., Aug. 29, 1809, and died at Boston, Oct. 7, 1894. He graduated in 1829, and, having decided to study medicine, spent two years in Europe. On his return, he was appointed professor of anatomy and physiology at Dartmouth College, but resigning in 1841 engaged in general practice at Boston. In 1847, he was appointed professor of anatomy at Harvard, and was one of the first to prove the contagiousness of puerperal fever. He had written poetry at college, and published a modest volume of verse in 1836, but his powers were scarcely suspected until he began, in the pages of the "Atlantic Monthly" (1857), his "Autocrat of the Breakfast Table," which secured his fame. In 1858, he issued "The Professor," and, later, "The Poet at the Breakfast Table." In the following year he tried his hand at more formal fiction and issued "Elsie Venner," a rather extravagant study of heredity. "The Guardian Angel," the best work he did in fiction, appeared in 1867. "Songs in Many Keys" made its advent in 1862; this and his "Songs of Many Seasons" (1875), contained many of the poems he had contributed to the "Atlantic Monthly," as well as those written for various social occasions. In 1882, he resigned his professorship, and four years later revisited Europe, where he was received with great cordiality and even enthusiasm. On his return he published a lively narrative of his experiences, entitled "Our Hundred Days in Europe." Among his other works are "Currents and Counter-Currents" (1861); "Soundings from the Atlantic" (1864); "Mechanism in Thought and Morals" (1871); "Memoirs of Motley" (1879); "Emerson" (1885), and "Before the Curfew" (1888). Dr. Holmes's "Breakfast Table" books are his most delightful work, replete with shrewd wisdom, seasoned with humor, and at times tender with pathos. In verse-making he had happy gifts, and was in turn graceful and satiric, as well as gay and fluent.

LECTURE ON THE RELIGIOUS POETRY OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

DELIVERED NOVEMBER 4, 1853, BEFORE THE MERCANTILE LIBRARY
ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK

THERE is one class of poetry which comes home to every human heart in every civilized and Christian land. The song of love and glory grows dull to those who have outlived their passions and earthly aspirations; but the poem for every ear and age, equally in place over the cradle, over the bed of that final slumber which needs

(381)

no melody to make it deeper, at the foot of the scaffold, in the darkened cathedral, is the holy song which brings everywhere solemn thoughts, peace, and grateful tears.

The author of one truly devotional English hymn has made himself a home in the hearts of both continents. But the real hymn needs true devotional character and simplicity, which I fear the productions of the present century do not always possess; but in their place a strain of affected sentiment and forced ornament.

And so it has been, more or less, since the rough verses of Sternhold and Hopkins; rough, but natural and unaffected, and imbued with a conscious fervor which the critics of later days would have refined away. On the other hand there is the fault, too often chargeable to their school, of turning Scripture into too homely phrases. I will offer a few remarks on the older authors as an introduction to the more recent. Watts, though voluminous and unequal, is still the great centre of English devotional poetry; and for this reason religion must be uppermost in the heart of him who composes hymns that are to seize and keep their hold on the general heart. His hymns have struck deeper into the heart than any ever written by any Protestant. Doddridge has more sentimentality, but less sincere religious solemnity. Cowper is sometimes worthy of his fame, but too often savors of his friend, John Newton. Among the writers of the present century Montgomery is oftenest found in the hymn-books. He has written a number of hymns which do not rank high above the general level of such compositions; but his popularity is chiefly owing to the absence of pretension and display.

The fault of the hymns of this century is that they are overloaded with ornament—somewhat like the favorite tune

of King Charles' organist, of which his Majesty used to think it ought to make the congregation dance in the aisle. Bowring is obnoxious to this criticism; his verses are too marked with scene-painting. Yet let us be grateful to him for "Watchman, tell us of the night."

Henry Kirke White wrote several grand and simple hymns; and a few of Milman's have found their way into the collections. His "Brother, thou art gone before us," may produce a good effect when sung, but is unworthy of him as it stands in the collection before me. Among the hymn-writers of this century the first place cannot be denied to Heber; even Keble owes him a great deal.

Of all the poets of this period there is none that does not appear pale and wan beside Byron, Moore, and Scott, except Heber. It is he alone can stand beside such a poem as "The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold." Heber was in earnest in poetry as in life; and thus it is that we love in his hymns that imaginative diction which we condemn in others. None but he could talk in sacred verse of "Afric's sunny fountains" and "India's coral strand." The richest diamonds are more frequently worn by sinners than saints; sanctity is generally lowly; but Heber could aim at gems; a high-bred Christian scholar, a man with Greek in his head and a mitre on it, ought to write as he wrote. I have seen nothing to equal Heber except one piece by an American clergyman, "Calm on the listening ear of night."

I have been struck with the manner in which sex shows itself in female hymns; they are always simple and trustful; their ornaments are humble, flowers and birds, while men seek the great elements of Nature. Mrs. Hemans's Pilgrim's song may be called a hymn, and what man has written such a hymn?

This **brief** survey shows that a truly beautiful hymn is one of the rarest and most difficult of human compositions. Many seem to consider Scott's "Song of Rebecca" a beautiful hymn as well as a fine poem; but a child would know the difference between such a song and a hymn flowing from a Christian heart. It is an emanation from the fancy more than from the affections. In every Christian body there are hymns which come from and go to the heart, as Scott's splendid rhetoric never can. "The turf shall be my fragrant shrine" is well enough; but to true devotional feeling this idea stands in about the same relation that the embroidered and scented curtain does to the rose of June.

The "Christian Year" of Keble is very Anglican in its character; it is not properly meant for dissenters, and therefore I perhaps should not find fault with it for the character mentioned. Yet a work meant for any class of Christians ought to contain something fit for all. In his material imagery he savors something of Romanism, but in his poem on the gunpowder treason he takes good care to let us know he is not a Papist. It is to be regretted that his verses are not fit for a church without a bishop, or a state without a king.

But in religious, as in other literature, there must be a higher walk; there must be some difference between the music of a camp-meeting and "Te Deum" in "Notre Dame." The religious world stratifies itself in obedience to natural law. Yet there is a great deal through the book which may be read with delight.

Moore and Byron have sometimes come within sight of the sanctuary; but here the high priest himself comes forth. I fancy I can sometimes trace the molds in which some of his productions have been formed; I can now recognize Mil-

ton, and again George Herbert; but I don't mention this to detract from Mr. Keble's merit. No doubt he meets the wants of many gentle and contemplative natures better than any other religious poet of the time.

I have so belabored the poetry of the next writer I am about to mention that I might seem to be hostile to his creed; but I find his creed the same as that of Dr. Watts. I should not notice his work, but that it is so often reprinted, which fact shows that it cannot be mere trumpery. "The Course of Time," by Robert Pollok, a young Scottish clergyman, was introduced to the world with extravagant eulogies. Some extracts which appeared in the papers did not seem to justify the claims that had been made for it; it appeared, was widely read, and greatly admired; then it was seen in auction rooms; and finally gravitated from the higher literary circles. Yet it has always had numerous admirers. Pollok is the Scotch Dante, and his poem the Scotch "Inferno." He dwells with a frightful gusto on the torments to which the Creator condemns lost souls; a gusto amounting to a perversity almost incredible in any being that ever hung at a mother's breast. He gloats over unending tortures as an expert of the Inquisition might be expected to gloat over an unfortunate human being tried with the dry pan and the slow fire. Whoever has read the sermon of Jonathan Edwards, a production well suited to produce in the audience untimely births, and supply from it new inmates for the mad-house, can tell what he thinks of the moral effect of such discourses as these. And Pollok was a fellow countryman of Burns, who could not think even on "Auld Nickieben" without some pity! We can read the "Inferno" with an allowance; we know where it was written and when; and the tortures it paints in the next world were not inaptly foreshadowed by

the rack and the ecclesiastical tribunal in this. Besides, in Dante's delineations there is something appropriate to his theme and style; the Inferno is the mortal chamber in the Temple of Sin; we receive mysterious glimpses of it, it is wrapt in a fitting gloom and dimness. But the grim Scotchman shows death and torture in daylight and with labored display. The keeper of wild beasts thrusts his hand into their den; we hear the lions growl and see the fierce sparkle in the tiger's eye; but such exhibitions do not please us.

Lucretius himself said, "It is pleasant to stand on the shore and see another struggling with the billows." Rochefoucauld declares there is something agreeable to us in the misfortunes of our best friend. But let us not forget there are men who would jump into the waves to aid their fellows and risk their own safety and even lives to protect a stranger from violence.

Dumas knew well enough how to turn to account portraits of persons stretched an inch or two beyond their usual length, of human beings, writhing in the *peine forte et dure*, but I am not aware of any moral improvement to be derived from such contemplations; from painting the effects of fire on the human body; from sharing the feelings of Saul when he held the raiment of the ruffians who were beating Stephen to death. Does that poetry make the world wiser or better which shelters itself under the authority of Scripture, to stick its tooth into the souls of men and women who have not yet passed the dread tribunal? Strangely enough the poet's genius seems to forsake him when he comes to speak of happiness. He has a gem leaping in the coronet of love! And again, young love is sparkling cream and silken down! Spencer discourses of love in fitter strains. The humility of the sinner, the tender sentiments, find small expression in

these pages. I have read the book without finding a page dimmed with the dew which is sure to be shed where the heart is touched. His Byronic Address to the Deity and his imitation of Byron's "Ocean," are models of bathos. Here is a passage:

"The orphan child laid down his head and died,
Nor unamusing was his piteous cry
To women, who had now laid tenderness
Aside, best pleased with sights of cruelty."

If the man who wrote these lines had ever known a mother, a sister, or a wife, he never could have spit so venomous a lie into the face of woman. I have found so many offensive passages that I feel justified in the severity with which I have treated his poem; yet there must be something in it, else it would not maintain so much of popularity as it does. It has a claim to attention for its mighty plan; the subject is the grandest ever ventured on by mortal; and the work has a certain seriousness and solemnity which shows the writer was in earnest. A great deal that seems to come from a bad heart may be traced to low breeding, a gloomy faith, and a diseased bodily condition. A man with one leg, or even a man in a tight boot, is not what he would be with a full allowance of limbs and an unpinched foot. Pollok labored under a disease which brought his life to an early close. Had I known him and seen some passages of his poem, my treatment would not have been critical but professional.

We are jealous of the admission of vice into literature, but we tolerate all kinds of whinings. If books were properly entitled, some would be called "Dyspeptic Reflections on the State of Man" or "An Essay by an American Author of Well-Known Debility." "The Course of Time" is such a book. It has pleasing passages, which want of time prevents my alluding to more fully. With the exception of the lines

on Byron, which the subject recommended, none of them have become familiar. Pollok's power of conception of the grand was, I do not doubt, ample, but he rushed in where angels would have feared to tread.

LEAVE NO VERBAL MESSAGE

SPEECH AT DINNER [OF MASSACHUSETTS MEDICAL SOCIETY, BOSTON,
MAY, 1856

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN,—It is the peculiar privilege of occasions like the present to indulge in such reasonable measure of self-congratulation as the feeling of the hour may inspire. The very theory of the banquet is that it crowns the temples with roses and warms the heart with wine, so that the lips may speak more freely and the ears may listen more lovingly, and our better natures brought into close communion for an hour may carry away the fragrance of friendship mingled with the odor or the blossoms that breathed sweet through the festal circle.

We have suppressed the classical accompaniments of good fellowship, but we claim all its license. Nor are we alone in asserting a title to this indulgence. Of all the multitudinous religious associations that are meeting around us, I have yet to learn that there is one which does not assert or assume its own peculiar soundness in the faith. I have seen a black swan and a white crow in the same collection, but I never heard of a political assembly where all its own crows were not white, and all the swans of all other political avia-ries were not blacker than midnight murder or noonday ruf-fianism.

The few words I have to speak are uttered more freely

because my relations with the medical profession are incidental rather than immediate and intimate. My pleasant task is all performed in the porch of the great temple where you serve daily. I need not blush then to speak the praises of the divine art, even if you should blush to hear them.

I hear it said from time to time that the physician is losing his hold on the public mind. I believe this remark belongs to a class of sayings that repeat themselves over and over, like the Japanese machine-made prayers which our travellers tell us of, and with about as much thought in them. There are country people that are always saying there is a great want of rain—they would have said so in Noah's flood—for the first fortnight, at least; there are city folks for whom business is always dull and money is always tight; there are politicians that always think the country is going to ruin, and there are people enough that will never believe there are any "good old fashioned snow storms" nowadays, until they have passed a night in the cars between a couple of those degenerate snow banks they despise so heartily. There are many things of this sort which are said daily, which always have been said, and always will be said, with more or less of truth, but without any such portentous novelty as need frighten us from our propriety.

We need not go beyond our own limits, Mr. President, to find ample reason for proclaiming boldly that the medical profession was never more truly honored or more liberally rewarded than at this very time and in this very place. There never lived in this community a practitioner held in more love and veneration by all his professional brethren and by the multitude who have profited by his kind and wise counsel than he who, having soothed the last hours of his long cherished friend and associate, still walks among us bearing his

burden of years so lightly that he hardly leans upon the staff he holds; himself a staff upon which so many have leaned through fifty faithful years of patient service. Talk about the success of the unworthy pretender as compared with that of the true physician—why, what man could ever have built up such a fame among us, if he had not laid as its cornerstone, truth, fidelity, honor, humanity—all cemented with the courtesy that binds these virtues together in one life-long inseparable union.

“ Do you complain of the failing revenues of the profession? I question whether from the time when Boylston took his pay in guineas, through the days when John Warren the elder counted his gains in continental currency, looking well in the ledger and telling poorly at the butcher’s and the baker’s, there was ever a prettier pile made daily than is built up by one of our living brethren who fought his way up stream until the tide turned and wafted him into reputation, which makes his labors too much for one man and something over two horses. The success of one such diligent and faithful practitioner is the truest rebuke to charlatanism. It is a Waterloo triumph, a Perry’s victory, not over the squadrons of *Lake Erie*, but the piratical craft of *Quack-ery*.

“ This world is not so different now from what it always has been. Pliny tells us stories of medical pretenders as good as any modern ones. Dionis has given us in a dozen pages a very pleasant account of the famous charlatans of his own time, which one of our good friends has translated for us into equally pleasant English. The particular shoe that pinches at the moment seems, it is true, the most ill-conditioned bit of leather that was ever cobbled, yet there has always been about the same amount of pinching from the same cause.

You complain for instance of my old friends, the homœopathists. I grant you it is provoking to see a former patient smacking his lips over their Barmecide therapeutics. But, after all, they are less exceptionable, personally, and less dangerous than many other wholesale theorists. Then look for a moment at the course which the system follows in almost any community. It appropriates a certain predisposed fraction of the public, and having made converts of them for a longer or shorter period, its power is mainly exhausted in that locality. And what are these predisposed subjects? Many are simple and credulous, some are intellectual and cultivated, not a few of eminent social standing; but with rare exceptions they are just exactly the most restless, uncomfortable class of patients the physician has to deal with, poets with bilious fancies, divines whose medical opinions are offered as gratuitously as your advice is expected to be given; philosophical dilettanti who insist on being dissatisfied with the only kind of answer a reasonable patient should expect.

“*Opium facit dormire*
Quia est in eo
Virtus dormitiva,
Cujus est natura,
*Sensus assoupire.”*¹

All that class, in short, who, instead of pulling the ropes as they are bid when there is a heavy gale and a lee shore, insist on going aft and breaking the eleventh commandment—

“No conversation with the man at the helm!”

On the whole, if our friends, who have a perfect right to choose their own names will spare us that little impertinence of calling medical practitioners “allopathists,” the profession

¹ “Opium makes one sleep because it possesses a soporific virtue, the nature whereof is to allay the senses.”

is well off to have no worse antagonists. The next fancy that turns up may not be as harmless. The old brown rat of England was bad enough but by and by the gray Hanover rat came and ate him up. Unfortunately he ate up the cheese and the bacon, too, and a great deal faster than the old practitioner had done before him.

We may be well contented then. If we have one man living among us as much loved and esteemed as ever a physician has been; if we have one man who makes his calling as remunerative as any have ever done in the midst of us, we may be sure there is no lack of respect or reward to all who deserve either. If our most obvious antagonism comes in a comparatively inoffensive shape and with very limited powers of aggression we need not complain of our professional position.

Count in the published lists all that practice the healing art in this great centre of population and who stand outside of your fellowship; all that trade in the fantastic pretences of the many counterfeits that infest the outskirts of medical practice; the eclectics, the mesmerists, the botanics, and the rest; rake all the dark alleys where the advertising sharper lurks behind his half-open door and his alias; count everything, male and female, red, white, and black, clean and unclean, and though the catalogue is freely open to every knave and ignoramus it will be short compared to the list of the names which you enroll among your numbers from the same community. Weigh the amount of character, ability, and knowledge represented in this list against the string of obscurities and more odious notorieties in the other, and you may judge if health or life are anything to your fellow citizens, what place we must hold in their regard.

"Hi regebant fata,"—these governed the fates, said the

Natural Historian of ancient Rome speaking of physicians. Governed the fates! Yes, and not only the fates of those that were under their immediate care but often through them the fates of empires and of interests wider and deeper than those of any earthly dynasty. Think of Dubois the elder, when the question was trembling in the balance whether France should be without an empress or her imperial master without an heir! Or go back to that bloody day of Saint Bartholomew and look into the royal assassin's chamber—whom will you find there, hidden from the savage clubs and the crashing guns that were filling the streets with victims, while the bells of St. Germain l'Auxerrois were pealing their death notes to the hunted Huguenots? No brother, guilty of believing the detested creed; no mistress whose blood was tainted with the stain of heresy; no favorite leader in arms, or council who had dared to defend the obnoxious faith—for Coligny's white hairs were the first to be dabbled in their blood; not one of these but the wise old man to whom Charles the Ninth once owed his accursed life; for the divine art sheds its blessings, like the rain, alike on the just and the unjust; the good and great surgeon, too good and too great for such a crowned miscreant, our own old patriarch of chirurgery—Ambrose Paré.

Say, come down to nearer times and places, and look into the chamber where our own fellow citizen struck down without warning by the hand of brutal violence lies prostrate, and think what fearful issues hang on the skill or incompetence of those who have his precious life in charge. One little error, and the *ignis sacer*, the fiery plague of the wounded, spreads its angry blush over the surface and fever and delirium are but the preludes of deadlier symptoms. One slight neglect, and the brain oppressed with the products of

disease grows dreamy and then drowsy; its fine energies are palsied and too soon the heart that filled it with generous blood is stilled forever. It took but a little scratch from a glass broken at his daughter's wedding to snatch from life the great anatomist and surgeon, Spigelius, almost at the very age of him for whose recovery we look not without anxious solicitude.

At such an hour as this more than at any other we feel the dignity, the awful responsibility of the healing art. Let but that life be sacrificed and left unavenged, and the wounds of that defenceless head, like the foul witch's blow on her enchanted image, are repeated on the radiant forehead of Liberty herself and flaw the golden circlet we had vainly written with the sacred name of Union!

"Dii, prohibete minas! Dii, talem avertite casum."¹

I give you, Mr. President, "The Surgeons of the city of Washington—God grant them wisdom, for they are dressing the wounds of a mighty empire and of uncounted generations."

TRIBUTE TO PAUL MORPHY

DELIVERED AT PUBLIC BANQUET HELD IN BOSTON, MAY 31, 1859

WE have met, gentlemen, some of us as members of a local association, some of us as its invited guests, but all of us as if by a spontaneous, unsolicited impulse to do honor to our young friend who has honored us and all who glory in the name of Americans, as the hero of a long series of bloodless battles won for our common country.

¹ "Ye gods forefend from the threats! Ye gods avert such a misfortune!"

His career is known to you all. There are many corners of our land which the truly royal game of kings and conquerors has not yet reached, where if an hour is given to pastime it is only in an honest match of checkers played with red and white kernels of corn, probably enough upon the top of the housewife's bellows. But there is no gap in the forest, there is no fresh trodden waste in the prairie which has not heard the name of the New Orleans boy who left the nursery of his youth like one of those fabulous heroes of whom our childhood loved to read, and came back bearing with him the spoils of giants whom he had slain after overthrowing their castles and appropriating the allegiance of their queens.

I need not, therefore, tell his story. It is so long that it takes a volume to tell it. It is so brief that one sentence may embrace it all. Honor went before him and victory followed after.

You knew the potential significance and the historical dignity of that remarkable intellectual pursuit, which although it wears the look of an amusement and its student uses toy-like implements as did the great inventor of logarithms, Napier of Merchiston, in the well-known ivory bones or rods by which he performed many calculations, has yet all the characters of a science, say rather of a science mingled with a variable human element, so that the perfect chess player would unite the combining powers of Newton with the audacity of Leverrier and the shrewd insight of Talleyrand. You know who of the world's masters have been chess players; happy for the world had some of them been nothing worse than chess players! You know who have celebrated the praises of the art in prose and verse; among them the classic Italian remembered in those lines of Pope:

"Immortal Vida, on whose honored brow
The poet's bays and critic's ivy grow,—"

who wrote one poem on the Heavenly Teacher, one on the Art of Poetry, and one on the Game of Chess.

That you knew all this may be taken for granted. I need not say that there is something very different from, something far deeper than the pride which belongs to the professed amateurs or the outside admirers of this particular game, noble as it is, famous as it is, which brings us together.

No, gentlemen, this seemingly gracious and pleasing occasion is far more than it seems. Through these lips of ours, as through those which have spoken before us and shall speak after us the words of welcome to our young friend, there flows the warm breath of that true American feeling which makes us all one in the moment of every great triumph achieved by a child of the Great Republic!

We who look upon the sun while the old world sleeps are after all but colonists and provincials in the eye of the ancient civilizations. There are Europeans enough, otherwise intelligent, who, if we may trust the stories of travellers, would be puzzled to say whether a native American of the highest race caught in one of our streets would be white, or black, or red. It cannot be disguised that we have been subject to the presumption of inferiority as a new people, and that nothing has been granted us except what we have taken at the cannon's mouth, at the point of the bayonets, or in that close Indian hug of peaceful but desperate competition in which, sooner or later, must crack the loins of the civilization belonging to one or the other of the two hemispheres.

It would be tedious and ungenial to show in all its details how the American has had to make his way against these obstacles to the position he now holds before the nations. It

took the revolutionary war to disprove the assertion that a British officer with a few regiments could march through the length and breadth of our land in the face of its disorderly rebels. Once more we had to argue the question over with our dear obstinate old parent, and it was only after lugging in a dozen of his sea bulldogs by the ears that we succeeded in satisfying him that we could reason yardarm to yardarm as convincingly as we had argued bayonet to bayonet.

You are not old enough, my young friend, to remember the 8th of January, 1815, but you may have heard of a great discussion which took place on that day near your native city of New Orleans. The same question was debated. If the logic of Mr. Andrew Jackson had failed to convince the opposite party, and Mr. Pakenham's syllogism as to provincial inferiority had been followed out in its corollary of sword and fire, your little game of life, sir, might never have been played, which would have been a great misfortune to us and all the world,—except perhaps the late chess champion of England, Mr. Howard Staunton.

We love our British cousins too well to repeat all the sharp things they have said of us. Reviewers, tourists, philosophers like Coleridge and Carlyle, nay some who had lived among us until their flesh and blood had become American, and their very bones were made over again out of our earth, have all had their fling at the colonists and provincials. Such tricks are catching and have reappeared on the other side of the channel. After all the noble words spoken of our land and its institutions by writers like De Tocqueville and Chevallier, M. Jules Janin could not let the queen of tragedy visit us without warning her against the barbarians of the new world, so terrible did we seem to the smooth round coop-fed feuilletoniste of the Parisian cockneys.

Now, gentlemen, there are two ways of meeting this prejudice so natural to the good people of the overripe half of the planet. We can confess the fact of our green immaturity, but argue from the history of the past that we may yet come to something. We can show that all mankind are colonists and provincials with reference to some point or points from which they started; that England herself is but a settlement formed by a band of invading robbers crossed upon a mob of emigrant squatters. We can show that the children of nations have often lived to feed, to teach, and when necessary to chastise their parents. We can remind our old-country friends that Macedonia, the kingdom of the world's conqueror, and the home of the world's philosopher, was but a rough province, speaking a language hardly understood at Athens; and that the great epic, the great poem, the great work of antiquity was written, or spoken, or sung, not in the phrase familiar to Attic ears, but in the liquid dialect of remote provincial Ionia.

That is the first way of arguing the matter. The second course is much shorter and more satisfactory. It consists in administering what in the dialect of our Yankee Ionia is called "a good licking," of course in the most polite and friendly way, to the other party in the discussion whenever we get a chance. And that chance has of late years been afforded us pretty often.

Let us look very briefly at the experiments we have tried in this direction. The first was to take the rod of iron with which we were ruled,—namely, a ramrod with a ball cartridge at the end of it,—and break it over the backs of those who had abused it. This lesson, as we said, had to be repeated, and we trust that costly way of teaching will never have to be tried again with our sturdy old parent.

And thus the great and beneficent era of competition in the arts of peace was at last inaugurated. Now it is not fair to ask everything at once of a young and growing civilization. When our backwoodsmen have just made a clearing we do not expect them to begin rearing Grecian temples, but was not and is not the settler's log cabin good of its kind—better than Irish shanties and English hovels? As larger wants unfolded we have had a fair opportunity of showing what we could do. The first great work of civilized men everywhere is to tame nature. And some of her wild creatures are never yet wholly tamed, though the old world has been at work at them for thousands of years. There is the earth—that huge, dumb servant, out of whose sturdy strength by goading and scourging and scarifying, we wring the slow secret toil that fills his brown arms with food for our necessities. There is the sleepless, restless, complaining monster, that overlaps two thirds of our globe with his imbricated scales, the great ocean—architect and destroyer of continents. There is man's noblest servant among the unreasoning tribes of being, of whom the oldest and grandest of books says that “his neck is clothed with thunder,” whose nature the classic fable blended with that of man himself to make the centaur, rival of demigods.

Who has tamed the earth, gentlemen, like the American, whose instruments of husbandry so far surpassed all others in the day of trial that they reaped not only all the grain before them, but all the honors and all the prizes, without leaving anything for the gleaners? Who has tamed the ocean like the American shipbuilder, whose keels have ploughed the furrows in which all the navies of the world may follow at their leisure? Who has so merited that noble Homeric name of horse-subduer—the proud title of heroes—

as the American enchanter, whose triumphs have never been approached before since Bucephalus trembled and stood still at the voice of Alexander.

It is time for the men of the old world to find out that they have to do with a people which, if we may borrow an expression from one of its earliest and greatest friends, "tramples upon impossibilities."

Let me give you proofs from one department of applied science. In the book before me (London, 1852) Mr. Ross, the great English optician, says that 135 degrees is the largest angular pencil of light that can be passed through a microscopic object-glass. On the cover of the object-glass before me, a glass made by Charles A. Spencer, then of Canastota, in the "backwoods" of New York, as they got it in London, is marked 146 degrees, which impossible angle he has since opened, as all the microscopic world knows, to the thrice impossible extent of 170 degrees and upward.

I mention this exceptionally to illustrate the audacity of democratic ingenuity in a department remote from the wants of common life. But it is to supply these common wants that the American brain has been chiefly taxed. Here it has known no equal. One other example is enough. It took a locksmith trained among the guessing Americans to pick the lock of the world's artificers and defy them all to push back the bolts of his own. So much, then, we have made thoroughly and triumphantly ours; the breast of the earth to feed us, the back of the ocean to bear us, the strength of the horse to toil for us, and the lock of the cunning artisan to protect the fruits of our labor from the rogues the old world sends us! We have had first to make life possible, then tolerable, then comfortable, and at last beautiful, with all that intellect can lend it.

And when the old world gets impatient that we will not do everything in the best way at once, when it is not contented with our material triumphs and that greatest of all triumphs—the self-government of thirty empires—not contented that we should move on as the great tide wave moves—one broad-breasted billow, and not a host of special narrow currents; when the old world, filled with those experts, who have often gained their skill for want of nobler objects, like the prisoners who carve cunning devices in their cells, becomes impatient, we must send over sometimes a man and sometimes a boy to try conclusions with its people in some peaceful contest of intelligence. And this young gentleman at my right, looking as tranquil and breathing as calmly as if he were not half smothered in his laurels, is one of the boys we sent. No! I am wrong. The thoughtful mothers of America would have cried out against us with one voice if we had sent this immature youth, his frame not yet knit together in perfect manhood, to task his growing brain in those tremendous conflicts which made the huge Père Morel, the veteran of the Café de la Régence, strike his broad forehead and beg to be released from the very thought of following the frightful complexity of their bewildering combinations. No! the men, with their ambition and proud confidence in his strength, might have been willing to send him, but the women with their tender love as mothers and sisters and—well-wishers, would have said, “He shall not go!”

He went. It was not we that sent him—it was honor! And when we meet to welcome his triumphant return we know what his victories mean. We have had one more squeeze at the great dynamometer which measures the strength of the strongest of the race. There it lies in the central capital of Europe. The boy has squeezed it and it is not

now the index that moves, but the very springs that are broken!

The test is as true a one of cerebral powers as if a hundred thousand men lay dead upon the field where the question was decided,—as if a score of line-of-battle ships were swinging, blackened wrecks, upon the water after a game between two mighty admirals. Where there is a given maximum there is always a corresponding average, and there is not one of us who does not think better of the head he carries on his own shoulders since he finds what a battery it is that lies beneath the smooth forehead of this young brother American.

As I stretch my hand above this youthful brow it seems to me that I bear in it the welcome, not of a town or a province, but of a whole people. One smile, one glow of pride and pleasure runs over all the land, from the shore which the sun first greets to that which looks upon the ocean where he lets fall the blazing clasp of his dissolving girdle,—from the realm of our northern sister who looks down from her throne upon the unmelted snows of Katahdin, to hers of the broad river and the still bayou who sits fanning herself among the full-blown roses and listening to the praises of her child as they come wafted to her on every perfumed breeze.

I propose the health of Paul Morphy, the world's chess champion: His peaceful battles have helped to achieve a new revolution; his youthful triumphs have added a new clause to the Declaration of American Independence!

ADDRESS OF WELCOME

DELIVERED AT AN ALUMNI DINNER, CAMBRIDGE, JULY 16, 1863

BROTHERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE ALUMNI,—It is your misfortune and mine that you must accept my services as your presiding officer of the day in the place of your retiring president. I shall not be believed if I say how unwillingly it is that for the second time I find myself in this trying position; called upon to fill, as I best may, the place of one whose presence and bearing, whose courtesy, whose dignity, whose scholarship, whose standing among the distinguished children of the university, fit him alike to guide your councils and to grace your festivals. The name of Winthrop has been so long associated with the State and with the college that to sit under his mild empire is like resting beneath one of these wide-branching elms the breadth of whose shade is only a measure of the hold its roots have taken in the soil.

In the midst of civil strife we, the children of this our common mother, have come together in peace. And surely there never was a time when we more needed a brief respite in some chosen place of refuge, some unviolated sanctuary, from the cares and anxieties of our daily existence than at this very hour. Our life has grown haggard with excitement. The rattle of drums, the march of regiments, the gallop of squadrons, the roar of artillery, seem to have been continually sounding in our ears day and night, sleeping and waking, for two long years and more. How few of us have not trembled and shuddered with fear over and over again for those

whom we love. Alas! how many that hear me have mourned over the lost—lost to earthly sight, but immortal in our love and their country's honor! We need a little breathing space to rest from our anxious thoughts, and, as we look back to the tranquil days we passed in this still retreat, to dream of that future when in God's good time, and after his wise purpose is fulfilled, the fair angel who has so long left us shall lay her hand upon the leaping heart of this embattled nation and whisper, peace! be still!

Here of all places in the world we may best hope to find the peace we seek for. It seems as if nothing were left undisturbed in New England except here and there an old graveyard, and these dear old College buildings, with the trees in which they are embowered. The old State House is filled with those that sell oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money. The Hancock house, the umbilical scar of the cord that held our city to the past, is vanishing like a dimple from the water.

But Massachusetts, venerable old Massachusetts, stands as firm as ever; Hollis, this very year a centenarian, is waiting, with its honest red face in a glow of cordiality, to welcome its hundredth set of inmates; Holden Chapel, with the skulls of its Doric frieze and the unpunishable cherub over its portal, looks serenely to the sunsets; Harvard, within whose ancient walls we are gathered, and whose morning bell has murdered sleep for so many generations of drowsy adolescents, is at its post, ready to startle the new-fledged freshmen from their first uneasy slumbers. All these venerable edifices stand as they did when we were boys,—when our fathers were boys,—when our grandfathers were boys. Let not the rash hand of innovation violate their sanctities, for the cement that knits their walls is no vulgar mortar, but is

tempered with associations and memories which are stronger than the parts they bind together!

We meet on this auspicious morning forgetting all our lesser differences. As we enter these consecrated precincts, the livery of our special tribe in creed and in politics is taken from us at the door, and we put on the court dress of our gracious Queen's own ordering, the academic robe, such as we wore in those bygone years scattered along the seven last decades. We are not forgetful of the honors which our fellow students have won since they received their college "parts,"—their orations, dissertations, disquisitions, colloquies, and Greek dialogues. But to-day we have no rank; we are all first scholars. The hero in his laurels sits next to the divine rustling in the dry garland of his doctorate. The poet, in his crown of bays, the critic, in his wreath of ivy, clasp each other's hands, members of the same happy family. This is the birthday feast for every one of us whose forehead has been sprinkled from the font inscribed "*Christo et Ecclesiæ*." We have no badges but our diplomas, no distinctions but our years of graduation. This is the republic carried into the university; all of us are born equal into this great fraternity.

Welcome, then, welcome, all of you, dear brothers, to this our joyous meeting! We must, we will call it joyous, though it comes with many saddening thoughts. Our last triennial meeting was a festival in a double sense, for the same day that brought us together at our family gathering gave a new head to our ancient household of the university. As I look to-day in vain for his stately presence and kindly smile, I am reminded of the touching words spoken by an early president of the university in the remembrance of a loss not unlike our own. It was at the commencement exer-

cises of the year 1678 that the Reverend President Urian Oakes thus mourned for his friend Thomas Shepard, the minister of Charlestown, an overseer of the college: "Dici non potest quam me perorantem, in comitiis, conspectus ejus, multo jucundissimus, recrearit et refecerit. At non comparet hodie Shepardus in his comitiis; oculos huc illuc torqueo; quocumque tamen inciderint, Platonem meum intanta virorum illustrium frequentia requirunt; nusquam amicum et pernecessarium meum in hac solenni panegyri, inter hosce Reverendos Theologos, Academiae Curatores, reperire aut oculis vestigare possum."¹ Almost two hundred years have gone by since these words were uttered by the fourth president of the college, which I repeat as no unfitting tribute to the memory of the twentieth, the rare and fully ripened scholar who was suddenly ravished from us as some richly freighted argosy that just reaches her harbor and sinks under a cloudless sky with all her precious treasures.

But the great conflict through which we are passing has made sorrow too frequent a guest for us to linger on an occasion like this over every beloved name which the day recalls to our memory. Many of the children whom our Mother had trained to arts have given the freshness of their youth or the strength of their manhood to arms. How strangely frequent in our recent record is the sign interpreted by the words "*E vivis cesserunt stelligeri!*"² It seems as if the red war-planet had replaced the peaceful star, and these pages blushed like a rubric with the long list of the martyr-children

¹ "I cannot express how much comfort and edification his presence, so delightful, gave me when called upon to speak in our meetings. And to-day our Shepard is not to be seen in our meeting. I turn my eyes hither and thither; wherever they pause, they seek for my Plato in this assemblage of illustrious men. Nowhere can my eyes find him or detect my friend and coadjutor in this solemn throng, among these reverend divines, these guardians of the college."

² "Those marked with a star are no longer among the living."

of our university. I cannot speak their eulogy, for there are no phrases in my vocabulary fit to enshrine the memory of the Christian warrior,—of him—

“Who, doomed to go in company with Pain
And Fear and Bloodshed, miserable train,
Turns his necessity to glorious gain—”

“Who, whether praise of him must walk the earth
Forever, and to noble deeds give birth,
Or he must fall, to sleep without his fame,
And leave a dead, unprofitable name,
Finds comfort in himself and in his cause;
And while the mortal mist is gathering, draws
His breath in confidence of Heaven’s applause.”

Yet again, O brothers! this is not the hour for sorrow. Month after month until the months became years we have cried to those who stood upon our walls: “Watchmen, what of the night?” They have answered again and again: “The dawn is breaking,—it will soon be day.” But the night has gathered round us darker than before. At last—glory be to God in the highest!—at last we ask no more tidings of the watchmen, for over both horizons east and west bursts forth in one overflowing tide of radiance the ruddy light of victory!

We have no parties here to-day, but is there one breast that does not throb with joy as the banners of the conquering Republic follow her retreating foes to the banks of the angry Potomac? Is there one heart which does not thrill in answer to the drum-beat that rings all over the world as the army of the west, on the morning of the nation’s birth, swarms over the silent, sullen earthworks of captured Vicksburg,—to the reveille that calls up our Northern regiments this morning *inside* the fatal abatis of Port Hudson? We are scholars, we are graduates, we are alumni, we are a band of brothers, but beside all, beyond all, above all, we are American citizens. And now that hope dawns upon our land—nay, bursts upon it in a flood of glory,—shall we not feel

its splendors reflected upon our peaceful gathering, peaceful in spite of those disturbances which the strong hand of our citizen-soldiery has already strangled?

Welcome then, thrice welcome, scholarly soldiers who have fought for your and our rights and honor! Welcome, soldierly scholars who are ready to fight whenever your country calls for your services! Welcome, ye who preach courage as well as meekness, remembering that the Prince of Peace came also bringing a sword! Welcome, ye who make and who interpret the statutes which are meant to guard our liberties in peace, but not to aid our foes in war! Welcome, ye whose healing ministry soothes the anguish of the suffering and the dying with every aid of art and the tender accents of compassion! Welcome, ye who are training the generous youths to whom our country looks as its future guardians! Welcome, ye quiet scholars who in your lonely studies are unconsciously shaping the thought which law shall forge into its shield and war shall wield as its thunder-bolt!

And to you, Mr. President, called from one place of trust and honor to rule over the concerns of this our ancient and venerated institution, to you we offer our most cordial welcome with all our hopes and prayers for your long and happy administration.

I give you, brothers, "The association of the Alumni"; the children of our common mother recognize the man of her choice as their new father, and would like to hear him address a few words to his numerous family.

JULES FAVRE



JULES CLAUDE GABRIEL FAVRE, French statesman and orator, was born at Lyons, France, March 21, 1809, and died at Versailles, Jan. 19, 1880. While a law student in Paris he took part in the revolution of 1830, and subsequently became conspicuous at the Lyons Bar as a defender of political prisoners. In the revolution of 1848 he was especially prominent, and strenuously opposed the acts of Louis Napoleon as president. After the *coup d'état* of December, 1851, he confined his energies for several years entirely to his profession. In 1858, however, his defence of Orsini, the would-be assassin of the Emperor Louis Napoleon, brought him again to the fore and secured his election to the Corps Législatif as member for Paris. In that body he opposed the emperor's policy on leading public measures, his speeches on the Mexican expedition being particularly effective. In the closing months of the empire he vehemently opposed the measures which ultimately led to the Franco-Prussian War, and though opposed to the war when it had begun he patriotically aided his country's cause. After the fall of Sédan, Favre became vice-president of the provisional government and its minister of foreign affairs, subsequently conducting with Bismarck the preliminaries of peace. In 1871, he published his political apology, "*Le Gouvernement du 4 Septembre*," and soon after for a time withdrew from politics and devoted himself to law and literature. In 1876, he was returned to the Senate for the Department of the Rhône. As an eloquent Liberal and opposition leader, Favre appeared to advantage, but as a diplomatist he was a failure. His published works include "*Rome et la République Française*" (1871); "*Conférences et Discours Littéraires*" (1873); "*De la Reforme Judiciaire*" (1877); "*Conférences et Mélanges*" (1880); "*Discours Parlementaires*" (1881); and "*Plaidoyers Politiques et Judiciaires*" (1882). His writings and oratorical gifts won him a seat in the French Academy.

SPEECH BEFORE THE CORPS LÉGISLATIF

DELIVERED APRIL 12, 1860, AFTER THE PEACE OF VILLAFRANCA

GENTLEMEN,—The speakers to whom you listened during yesterday's session have apparently forborne to state definitely the questions raised by the debate now before the Chamber. It appears nevertheless that we are not able to evade them, so forcibly do they bear upon the

situation to which France is brought by an undertaking in which her honor, and perhaps also her fate, is involved. We should be lacking in our duty if we did not endeavor to indicate, according to our light, the solutions that the dignity and the interest of the country alike require.

I know that such language may seem over-bold in the face of a constitution which gives us so insignificant a part, reserving meanwhile one so vast for one all-powerful will; of a constitution that does not permit our words to go forth from this place without undergoing the humiliation of revision, and oftentimes the insult of mutilation. Nevertheless, since the opportunity to express an opinion is given, permit me to do it with the utmost frankness.

We have to discover what have been the fruits—what must be the consequences—of the glorious campaign so suddenly ended on the banks of the Mincio by a peace so unexpected.

You have not forgotten it: when a year ago at this time we had to point out the political purpose of this war we did not hesitate to affirm that it was the enfranchisement of Italy.

The official organs of the government maintained silence before you; but the only voice in this country which was and is permitted to make itself heard with authority as well as power made known to the world that we were not deceived in our apprehension of the causes and import of the great event which disquieted all Europe. To drive Austria back behind the Alps and to leave Italy free, such was the programme proposed to France, aroused and in arms, ready to pour out her treasure and her blood.

It must be admitted that this programme, despite its grandeur, was then little understood and not well received. The partisans of Italy were rare and little credited; general opinion judged them severely; it accepted too readily the ac-

cusations of frivolity and of inconsistency lavished upon this generous and devoted nation, and it appeared to many minds that in giving herself to it France would undertake labor both adventurous and unprofitable. I hasten to add, gentlemen, that the Italians responded nobly to their detractors. They have shown, as we were reminded yesterday, of what self-denial patriotism is the source: they have known how to silence old rivalries that have until now divided them, to control individual ambitions, to calm the passions, to re-establish order in the midst of the fermentation of popular victory; in short, to control factions which have always been represented as ready to rend each other.

This work of pacific assimilation, the real seal of Italian regeneration, is not only a moral conquest which is an honor to France, to whose intervention it is due, it is also for our own greatness, present and to come, a result immense and fruitful and which enables one to say that it has been an effort not alone for the success of a generous idea, but for the defence and consolidation of a great national interest.

Turn to the annals of history and you will see that since the fall of the Roman empire two rival interests have never ceased disputing the supremacy of Europe; this excessive hostility is that of two races personified, the one by Germany, the other by France. Italy has been their battlefield and their stake, as if God had reserved for her this chastisement as expiation for that servitude under whose weight she had during eight centuries crushed the entire world.

Then, in the Middle Ages, France was powerful enough to impose her rule upon the peninsula, to make of it a highway to the north, and it was toward this end that the efforts of the most glorious representatives of our monarchy tended; to-day if the interests are the same the means have changed;

that which is the best guarantee of the greatness and security of France is the independence and the unity of Italy.

If I had not heard yesterday expressions of distrust that astonished me I should not hesitate to characterize as pusillanimous a policy that is affrighted at beholding in that beautiful country a free and powerful nation. As for myself, when I cast my eyes over the map of Europe and see that vast triangle of which the centre is the Mediterranean, of which the sides are Italy and Spain, and of which France is the apex, with their twelve hundred leagues of coast, commanding from the ocean to the Adriatic, it appears that these three countries, united not by bonds of sovereignty but by an intelligent federation, developing by their unity the infinite riches of their wonderful soil, combining the treasures of their genius—artistic, industrial, military, scientific, and naval—are destined not to bring all Europe under their yoke, but to cause the shining upon her of an era of civilization and of prosperity, whose brilliancy one may not even imagine.

France in marching to the deliverance of Italy did not seek the realization of a sentimental Utopia; she carried out a wise policy; she remained faithful to the traditions of her past and to the law of her future. It was this that sober minds perceived clearly in the midst of these great events. As to the nation at large, it comprehended that the end being indicated honor made it a law to attain it. To drive Austria back behind the Alps, to make of Italy a nation free and independent, such was the promise made in the face of the world! You know, gentlemen, how these splendid hopes have been shattered!

Thanks to the impetuous courage of our legions and to the bravery of the Piedmontese troops Austria has not been

able to stand upon a single battlefield. Utterly routed by three great victories and a series of brilliant engagements, she retired precipitately within her fortresses; but with the army of debarkation carried by our fleet in the rear, on the right the Tuscan reinforcements burning with the desire to show themselves worthy of their glorious competitors, on the left the gallant monarch of Piedmont, and in the centre the great mass of our forces, she was not able to resist. Without doubt she might have allowed herself to be besieged behind her walls, but that was a measure fraught with peril in the face of an army inflamed by success, in the midst of a population thoroughly aroused and waiting only a favorable hour to rise in revolt.

With a final effort the war was gloriously finished and the word of France was maintained. I have no hesitation in affirming that no one then doubted of success; men the most opposed to the principle of war understood that the honor of France was engaged until the enterprise undertaken should be accomplished; that it was impossible to withdraw (the word does not belong to our nation), even to delay; and that the soldiers of our army gone down into Italy with the banner of liberators should not sheathe their swords until that banner should float in all parts of her territory occupied by Austria.

Nevertheless it was of no avail! In the same way that the decree for war had depended upon the will of one man, it depended also upon the same will to enchain victory and to leave unaccomplished the work with which the dignity and interest of the country were associated.

I do not say this, gentlemen, to criticise what is beyond my right, but I consider it a duty to allow no occasion to escape without pointing out the fate which has befallen my

country and to make her understand that she has placed herself in the hands of a master.

I say it boldly, the peace of Villa Franca gives the lie to the proclamation of the 3d of May! Therefore Italy has not consented to the re-establishment of Austria's power that it has been determined to impose upon her. Despite the injunctions of our diplomacy, despite the menaces of our official communications, she has marched with a firm and resolute step toward that great work of unity to which our government no longer accords its aid; she has placed her independence under the protection of the military loyalty of Victor Emmanuel, and also to-day under the safeguard of French honor, and to-day one can consider this important transformation as an accomplished fact.

Italy free from the Alps to the Adriatic—there you have the promise! It was not enough to make it at the beginning of the war at the head of the troops full of warlike enthusiasm, but later after victory. On the 8th of June, 1859, a proclamation was made to the Italians at Milan which remains famous. It said, "Providence sometimes vouchsafes to nations, as to individuals, the opportunity for sudden development, but only on condition that they know how to profit by it. Take advantage then of the chance which presents itself to you; your hopes for independence so long expressed, so often shattered, will be realized if you show yourselves worthy. League yourselves together with but one end in view—the enfranchisement of your country. Organize yourselves as a military force! Be to-day but soldiers; to-morrow you shall be the citizens of a great and free country."

The Italians, gentlemen, believed in these words. The noble city of Venice, so grand by reason of her traditions and her misfortunes, demonstrated by her heroic defence in

1848, saw on the horizon the ensigns of our ships, and even then saluted with enthusiasm the arrival of the cohorts of liberators. Suddenly the French flags disappeared and the glorious captive has fallen back yet more heavily under the weight of her chains! Listen to her groans, open your hearts to the recital of her woes, count the number of fugitives heartbroken for their country in its death-agony, and you will have no need to ask yourself if France can deny her responsibility or intrench herself in indifference.

Just here, gentlemen, is a dilemma from which we cannot escape: if the war of 1859 were legitimate it was only because Austrian domination was not; if the rule of Austria in Italy were legitimate then the war entered into by France was impious and contrary to the law of nations; if Austria wrought deeds of violence in Italy we should drive her out:—she is still there.

With the question put in this way, what do you make of it? A condition unsettled and consequently intolerable, an incertitude that paralyzes everything. This uncertainty must cease unless the honor of France is to be compromised,—since France cannot rest under the imputation of non-performance of her promises.

There are moreover, gentlemen, two logical sequences from which it is impossible to escape. That which is accomplished in northern Italy as a necessary consequence is repeated in its centre. These are the reasons which have dictated the policy of France toward the Holy See.

I feel the more authorized, gentlemen, to explain with frankness my position upon this Roman question brought forward yesterday, because the facts appear to me to have especial significance. It suffices only to inquire into them to comprehend our real situation! There has been much com-

ment upon the fluctuations in policy of the French government toward the Holy See; I believe myself that these variations are only seeming.

I do not deny that since the peace of Villa Franca, the cabinet of the Tuileries may not have made or appeared to make efforts to re-establish the Romans under the paternal yoke of the papacy, as an honorable speaker has yesterday said; but all the world will agree with me that it has been most easily resigned to the non-success of its negotiations, and that it has been but slightly surprised thereat. And just here I go straight to the truth! I pass over all the ambiguities, all the subterfuges, all the ruses of diplomacy and I arrive at this conclusion: The cabinet of the Tuileries has pronounced the condemnation of the temporal power of the papacy! In order to prove it it is not necessary to go back in memory to 1831 and to talk of the blood of a Bonaparte shed by pontifical hands! I prefer to confine myself to general facts whose tendency can escape no one.

To the great surprise of the entire world there appeared at the end of the year 1859 a pamphlet,—whose author I do not seek,—which was widely circulated, and for which the government allowed itself to be considered responsible. It is there then that its opinion is to be sought. Now that opinion is not doubtful, and I admired yesterday the chivalrous confidence of those who still assert that the government desires to maintain the temporal power of the papacy. Why should we delude ourselves? By a combination of divers circumstances, by a series of causes dating far back, the temporal power of the Pope is seriously menaced under the conditions in which it is exercised to-day. The Papal throne is to-day established upon a volcano, and the pontiff who is charged by God with the maintenance of order upon the earth

is himself constantly threatened by a revolution. He, the representative of the highest moral authority upon earth, maintains it only under the protection of foreign armies. These military occupations protect only to compromise him; they excite against him all the susceptibilities of the national sentiment, they demonstrate that he cannot confide himself to the love and respect of his people.

The policy of the government is herein so clearly explained that I have nothing to add to it. Considering its origin it would be easy for me to show by history that the temporal power is a fact analogous to numberless others of the same nature, that the establishment of feudalism explains. Entirely separate from dogma it in no way merits the reverence lavished upon it by those who believe it necessary to the exercise of spiritual authority.

Established during the twelfth century it has filled history by turns with the brilliancy of its services, the story of its intrigues, and the scandal of its crimes. Always too feeble to defend itself, constantly reduced to depend upon aid from without, it has also become a permanent cause of the divisions, the agitations, and the wars of Italy. Here you have the proof written upon every page of history; a fact of great value to recall in this discussion is that the temporal power of the Pope claimed as a guarantee of his spiritual independence has been on the contrary a cause of long servitude. Besides, what does it avail to talk of the past? Does not the spectacle that we have under our eyes suffice? Is it not shown that the temporal authority of the Holy See subsists only on condition that it is supported, sometimes by Austria, sometimes by France, and those who exert it are so thoroughly conscious of their unpopularity that abandoned to themselves they do not even wait for an uprising, but has-

ten to screen themselves by flight as soon as foreign occupation ceases to protect their tyranny.

Why this ceaseless talk of temporal independence which is but a fiction? And if it were permitted me to further explain my idea I could prove without difficulty that the Church herself, severed from the cares and perils of her temporary power, would be the greater in the eyes of the people, and her authority increased as it was purified.

But these great questions are not within our province. The domain within which I must restrict myself is that of policy, and there inevitable consequences obtrude themselves.

Well, then, if it be true that Italian unity is for France a question alike of interest and honor; if at the same time the temporal power is a permanent obstacle to this union, this power must be abolished. I do not say that it is necessary to employ the force of our arms, but that at least they shall not assist in its maintenance. It is time to put an end to this double game that is being played upon the banks of the Po and upon the Tiber.

Emancipators in the north, we cannot become subservient in the south; if it is objected that our soldiers protect the Holy Father at Rome, I respond that protection without obedience is either ridiculous, or it is oppression in disguise; if we are the defenders of the temporal power let us march upon Bologna already in insurrection, let us invade Romagna, establish the power of the Pope upon its ruins, and stifle liberty in Italian blood, that is the complement of the expedition to Rome. But if we recognize the rights of the people of Bologna by the same token we proclaim that of the Romans, and the presence of our troops that keep them in subjection is an insult to our policy.

Gentlemen, it is with genuine regret that I have heard ex-

tolled in this place the action of a French general who has placed his sword at the service of the pontifical power. I have no fear in saying that this decision will find little response from without, and that most of the old friends of this officer will experience as much sorrow as surprise at his extraordinary intention, but that which crowned the general astonishment and which caused me the utmost surprise was the affirmative sign by which the President of the Council of State made known yesterday that an authorization apparently asked for had been favorably received by the French government, and that it was permitted this officer to serve in the Pontifical army without losing his authority; therefore the statement is official; but there are moral effects greater than all administrative acts. Either the commission of this officer is absurd or it obliges him to take command of that army of mercenaries, Swiss, Germans, and Croatians, who sell their blood for the Papacy, to march at their head for the conquest of Romagna and to gather from the smoking walls of Bologna the bloody laurels of Colonel Schmidt. But on that day he will have facing him the allies of France, and perhaps behind the Piedmontese lines he will find the valiant legions whom he has so often led to victory, and there he will be reduced to the alternative of resigning his command or of drawing his sword against his country.

As for myself, I demand of the government that it cease those many equivocations unworthy of a nation like France, and that it put an end to the misunderstandings which are the direct consequence of a policy of liars and turncoats unacceptable to the country.

[Special translation by Mary Emerson Adams.]

WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE



THE RIGHT HON. WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE, great British statesman, financier, orator, and author, was born at Liverpool, England, Dec. 29, 1809, and died at Hawarden Castle, Wales, May 19, 1898. His father was Sir John Gladstone, a Scottish baronet and well-known merchant in Liverpool. His distinguished son was educated at Eton, and at Oxford, where he graduated in 1831 with high honors, and early manifested at the Oxford Union Debating Society his remarkable gifts as a debater and orator. Two years later he passed from the mimic Parliament to the greater one at Westminster, where he was, ere long, to take a memorable part in the political history of his country. He entered political life as a Conservative, and, winning the notice of Sir Robert Peel, became a junior lord of the Treasury, and in 1835, for a brief period, Under-Secretary for the Colonies. As a "Peelite," he held later the offices of Master of the Mint and president of the Board of Trade, and was sworn a member of the Privy Council. In 1845, he succeeded Lord Stanley (afterward Earl of Derby) as Secretary of State for the Colonies, and in 1847, on his representing Oxford University in Parliament, his political convictions underwent change, for abandoning Toryism he became a Liberal, while at the same time developing his gifts as a Parliamentary debater and great authority in finance. In the Aberdeen administration, and subsequently in that of Lord Palmerston, he held the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, and in 1858-59 undertook a special mission to the Ionian Islands to arrange some matters prior to their cession to Greece. In 1859, he was chosen rector of Edinburgh University, and in 1865, on the death of Palmerston, he became Chancellor of the Exchequer in Lord John Russell's ministry and leader in the Commons. After Mr. Disraeli's defeat (on Mr. Gladstone's resolutions in regard to the disestablishment of the Irish Church), his great Liberal adversary, in 1869, became for the first time Prime Minister. Mr. Gladstone held the premiership until 1873, during which he carried through the House much useful legislation, but suffered overthrow and retired from Parliament, giving place to the Disraeli administration. In the interval Mr. Gladstone was engaged in ecclesiastical controversy, during which he published his wrathful brochure on "The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance." In 1880, "the great Parliamentary hand" and his chief Liberal followers regained office, though harrassed by distress and sedition in Ireland, and by the embarrassments of the Egyptian war. In 1885, the Liberals were defeated and resigned, but in a few months Mr. Gladstone was again reinstated in office, when he introduced his Irish Home Rule Bill, which again brought defeat and resignation. He was, however, once more returned to power in 1893, though the Home Rule Bill was thrown out, and in the following year Lord Rosebery became Premier, and Mr. Gladstone, feeling the burden of years and the long strain of office, withdrew forever from the arena of his triumphs and defeats. Whatever may be thought of the "grand old man's" Irish policy or the few mistakes he made in legislation, there are few who would question the purity of his motives, the beneficence of his acts, or the lofty elevation of his character. His pen continued to be his solace in retirement, until his death in his ninetieth year. His chief writings embrace: "The State in Its Relations with the Church," "Studies on Homer," "Juventus Mundi," "Gleanings of Past Years," "The Impregnable Rock of Scripture," and "A Chapter of Autobiography."

ON DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DELIVERED AT WEST CALDER, NOVEMBER 27, 1879

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN,—In addressing you to-day, as in addressing like audiences assembled for a like purpose in other places of the county, I am warmed by the enthusiastic welcome which you have been pleased in every quarter and in every form to accord to me. I am, on the other hand, daunted when I recollect, first of all, what large demands I have to make on your patience; and secondly, how inadequate are my powers and how inadequate almost any amount of time you can grant me to set forth worthily the whole of the case which ought to be laid before you in connection with the coming election.

To-day, gentlemen, as I know that many among you are interested in the land and as I feel that what is termed “agricultural distress” is at the present moment a topic too serious to be omitted from our consideration, I shall say some words upon the subject of that agricultural distress and particularly because in connection with it there have arisen in some quarters of the country proposals which have received a countenance far beyond their deserts to reverse or to compromise the work which it took us one whole generation to achieve and to revert to the mischievous, obstructive, and impoverishing system of protection. Gentlemen, I speak of agricultural distress as a matter now undoubtedly serious. Let none of us withhold our sympathy from the farmer, the cultivator of the soil, in the struggle he has to undergo. His struggle is a struggle of competition with the United States. But I do not fully explain the case when I say the United States. It is not with

the entire United States, it is with the western portion of these States—that portion remote from the seaboard; and I wish in the first place, gentlemen, to state to you all a fact of very great interest and importance, as it seems to me, relating to and defining the point at which the competition of the western States of America is most severely felt. I have in my hand a letter received recently from one well-known and honorably known in Scotland—Mr. Lyon Playfair, who has recently been a traveller in the United States and who, as you well know, is as well qualified as any man upon earth for accurate and careful investigation. The point, gentlemen, at which the competition of the western States of America is most severely felt is in the eastern States of America. Whatever be agricultural distress in Scotland, whatever it be, where undoubtedly it is more felt in England, it is greater by much in the eastern States of America. In the States of New England the soil has been to some extent exhausted by careless methods of agriculture, and these, gentlemen, are the greatest of all the enemies with which the farmer has to contend.

But the foundation of the statement I make, that the eastern States of America are those that most feel the competition of the West is to be found in facts,—in this fact above all, not only they are not in America, as we are here, talking about the shortness of the annual returns and in some places having much said on the subject of rents and of temporary remission or of permanent reduction. That is not the state of things; they have actually got to this point that the capital values of land, as tested by sales in the market, have undergone an enormous diminution. Now I will tell you something that actually happened, on the authority of my friend Mr. Playfair. I will tell you something that has happened in one of the New England States,—not, recollect, in a desert

or a remote country,—in an old cultivated country and near one of the towns of these States, a town that has the honorable name of Wellesley.

Mr. Playfair tells me this: Three weeks ago—that is to say about the first of this month, so you will see my information is tolerably recent,—three weeks ago a friend of Mr. Playfair bought a farm near Wellesley for \$33 an acre,—for £6 12s. an acre,—agricultural land, remember, in an old settled country. That is the present condition of agricultural property in the old States of New England. I think by the simple recital of that fact I have tolerably well established my case, for you have not come in England and you have not come in Scotland to the point at which agricultural land is to be had—not wild land, but improved and old cultivated land,—is to be had for the price of £6 12s. an acre. He mentions that this is by no means a strange case, an isolated case, that it fairly represented the average transactions that have been going on; and he says that in that region the ordinary price of agricultural land at the present time is from \$20 to \$50 an acre, or from £4 to £10. In New York the soil is better and the population is greater; but even in the State of New York land ranges for agricultural purposes from \$50 to \$100, that is to say from £10 to £20 an acre.

I think those of you, gentlemen, who are farmers will perhaps derive some comfort from perceiving that if the pressure here is heavy the pressure elsewhere and the pressure nearer to the seat of this very abundant production is greater and far greater still.

It is most interesting to consider, however, what this pressure is. There has been developed in the astonishing progressive power of the United States—there has been developed a faculty of producing corn for the subsistence of man with a

rapidity and to an extent unknown in the experience of mankind. There is nothing like it in history. Do not let us conceal, gentlemen, from ourselves the fact; I shall not stand the worse with any of you who are farmers if I at once avow that this greater and comparatively immense abundance of the prime article of subsistence for mankind is a great blessing vouchsafed by Providence to mankind. In part I believe that the cheapness has been increased by special causes. The lands from which the great abundance of American wheat comes are very thinly peopled as yet. They will become more thickly peopled and as they become more thickly peopled a larger proportion of their produce will be wanted for home consumption and less of it will come to you, and at a higher price. Again, if we are rightly informed, the price of American wheat has been unnaturally reduced by the extraordinary depression, in recent times, of trade in America, and especially of the mineral trades, upon which many railroads are dependent in America and with which these railroads are connected in America in a degree and manner that in this country we know but little of. With a revival of trade in America it is to be expected that the freights of corn will increase and all other freights, because the employment of the railroads will be a great deal more abundant and they will not be content to carry corn at nominal rates. In some respects therefore you may expect a mitigation of the pressure, but in other respects it is likely to continue.

Nay, the prime minister is reported as having not long ago said,—and he ought to have the best information on this subject, nor am I going to impeach in the main what he stated,—he gave it to be understood that there was about to be a development of corn production in Canada which would entirely throw into the shade this corn production in the United

States. Well, that certainly was very cold comfort as far as the British agriculturist is concerned, because he did not say—he could not say—that the corn production of the United States was to fall off, but there was to be added an enormous corn production from Manitoba, the great Province which forms now a part of the Canada Dominion. There is no doubt, I believe, that it is a correct expectation that vast or very large quantities of corn will proceed from that Province and therefore we have to look forward to a state of things in which, for a considerable time to come, large quantities of wheat will be forthcoming from America, probably larger quantities and perhaps frequently at lower prices than those at which the corn-producing and corn-exporting districts of Europe have commonly been able to supply us. Now that I believe to be, gentlemen, upon the whole, not an unfair representation of the state of things.

How are you to meet that state of things? What are your fair claims? I will tell you. In my opinion your fair claims are, in the main, two. One is to be allowed to purchase every article that you require in the cheapest market and have no needless burden laid upon anything that comes to you and can assist you in the cultivation of your land. But that claim has been conceded and fulfilled.

I do not know whether there is an object, an instrument, a tool of any kind, an auxiliary of any kind, that you want for the business of the farmer which you do not buy at this moment in the cheapest market. But beyond that you want to be relieved from every unjust and unnecessary legislative restraint. I say every unnecessary legislative restraint because taxation, gentlemen, is unfortunately a restraint upon us all, but we cannot say that it is always unnecessary and we cannot say that it is always unjust. . . .

Now, gentlemen, having said thus much my next duty is to warn you against quack remedies, against delusive remedies, against the quack remedies that there are plenty of people found to propose, not so much in Scotland as in England; for, gentlemen, from Midlothian at present we are speaking to England as well as to Scotland. Let me give a friendly warning from this northern quarter to the agriculturist of England not to be deluded by those who call themselves his friends in a degree of special and superior excellence and who have been too much given to delude him in other times; not to be deluded into hoping relief from sources from which it can never come. Now, gentlemen, there are three of these remedies. The first of them, gentlemen, I will not call a quack remedy at all, but I will speak of it notwithstanding in the tone of rational and dispassionate discussion. I am not now so much upon the controversial portion of the land question—a field which, Heaven knows, is wide enough—as I am upon matters of deep and universal interest to us in our economic and social condition. There are some gentlemen and there are persons for whom I for one have very great respect, who think that the difficulties of our agriculture may be got over by a fundamental change in the land-holding system of this country.

I do not mean, now pray observe, a change as to the law of entail and settlement and all those restraints which I hope were tolerably well disposed of yesterday at Dalkeith, but I mean those who think that if you can cut up the land, or a large part of it, into a multitude of small properties that of itself will solve the difficulty and start everybody on a career of prosperity.

Now, gentlemen, to a proposal of that kind I for one am not going to object upon the ground that it would be incon-

sistent with the privileges of landed proprietors. In my opinion, if it is known to be for the welfare of the community at large, the legislature is perfectly entitled to buy out the landed proprietors. It is not intended probably to confiscate the property of a landed proprietor more than the property of any other man; but the state is perfectly entitled, if it please, to buy out the landed proprietors as it may think fit for the purpose of dividing the property into small lots. I don't wish to recommend it because I will show you the doubts that to my mind hang about that proposal; but I admit that in principle no objection can be taken. Those persons who possess large portions of the spaces of the earth are not altogether in the same position as the possessors of mere personalty; that personalty does not impose the same limitations upon the action and industry of man and upon the well-being of the community as does the possession of land; and therefore I freely own that compulsory expropriation is a thing which for an adequate public object is in itself admissible and so far sound in principle.

Now, gentlemen, this idea about small proprietors, however, is one which very large bodies and parties in this country treat with the utmost contempt; and they are accustomed to point to France, and say: "Look at France." In France you have got 5,000,000—I am not quite sure whether it is 5,000,000 or even more; I do not wish to be beyond the mark in anything—you have 5,000,000 of small proprietors, and you do not produce in France as many bushels of wheat per acre as you do in England. Well, now I am going to point out to you a very remarkable fact with regard to the condition of France. I will not say that France produces—for I believe it does not produce—as many bushels of wheat per acre as England does, but I should like to know whether the wheat of France is pro-

duced mainly upon the small properties of France. I believe that the wheat of France is produced mainly upon the large properties of France, and I have not any doubt that the large properties of England are upon the whole better cultivated and more capital is put into the land than in the large properties of France. But it is fair that justice should be done to what is called the peasant proprietary. Peasant proprietary is an excellent thing, if it can be had, in many points of view. It interests an enormous number of the people in the soil of the country and in the stability of its institutions and its laws. But now look at the effect that it has upon the progressive value of the land—and I am going to give you a very few figures which I will endeavor to relieve from all complication lest I should unnecessarily weary you. But what will you think when I tell you that the agricultural value of France—the taxable income derived from the land, and therefore the income of the proprietors of that land—has advanced during our lifetime far more rapidly than that of England? When I say England I believe the same thing is applicable to Scotland, certainly to Ireland; but I shall take England for my test because the difference between England and Scotland, though great, does not touch the principle, and because it so happens that we have some means of illustration from former times for England which are not equally applicable for all the three kingdoms.

Here is the state of the case. I will not go back any further than 1851. I might go back much further; it would only strengthen my case. But for 1851 I have a statement made by French official authority of the agricultural income of France as well as the income of other real property, namely, houses. In 1851 the agricultural income of France was £76,000,000. It was greater in 1851 than the whole income

from land and houses together had been in 1821. This is a tolerable evidence of progress, but I will not enter into the detail of it because I have no means of dividing the two—the house income and the land income—for the earlier year, namely, 1821. In 1851 it was £76,000,000—the agricultural income; and in 1864 it had risen from £76,000,000 to £106,000,000. That is to say, in the space of thirteen years the increase of agricultural values in France—annual values—was no less than forty per cent, or three per cent per annum. Now I go to England. Wishing to be quite accurate, I shall limit myself to that with respect to which we have positive figures. In England the agricultural income in 1813-14 was £37,000,000; in 1842 it was £42,000,000, and that year is the one I will take as my starting point. I have given you the years 1851 to 1864 in France. I could only give you those thirteen years with a certainty that I was not misleading you, and I believe I have kept within the mark. I believe I might have put my case more strongly for France.

In 1842, then, the agricultural income of England was £42,000,000; in 1876 it was £52,000,000—that is to say, while the agricultural income of France increased forty per cent in thirteen years the agricultural income of England increased twenty per cent in thirty-four years. The increase in France was three per cent per annum; the increase in England was about one half or three fifths per cent per annum. Now, gentlemen, I wish this justice to be done to a system where peasant proprietary prevails. It is of great importance. And will you allow me, you who are Scotch agriculturists, to assure you that I speak to you not only with the respect which is due from a candidate to a constituency, but with the deference which is due from a man knowing very little of agricultural matters to those who know a great deal?

And there is one point at which the considerations that I have been opening up, and this rapid increase of the value of the soil in France, bear upon our discussions. Let me try to explain it. I believe myself that the operation of economic laws is what in the main dictates the distribution of landed property in this country. I doubt if those economic laws will allow it to remain cut up into a multitude of small properties like the small properties of France. As to small holdings, I am one of those who attach the utmost value to them. I say that in the Lothians—I say that in the portion of the country where almost beyond any other large holdings prevail—in some parts of which large holdings exclusively are to be found—I attach the utmost value to them. But it is not on that point I am going to dwell, for we have no time for what is unnecessary. What I do wish very respectfully to submit to you, gentlemen, is this. When you see this vast increase of the agricultural value of France you know at once it is perfectly certain that it has not been upon the large properties of France, which, if anything, are inferior in cultivation to the large properties of England. It has been upon those very peasant-properties which some people are so ready to decry. What do the peasant-properties mean? They mean what in France is called the small cultivation—that is to say, cultivation of superior articles pursued upon a small scale—cultivation of flowers, cultivation of trees and shrubs, cultivation of fruits of every kind, and all that in fact which rises above the ordinary character of farming produce, and rather approaches the produce of the gardener.

Gentlemen, I cannot help having this belief that, among other means of meeting the difficulties in which we may be placed, our destiny is that a great deal more attention will have to be given than heretofore by the agriculturists of

England, and perhaps even by the agriculturists of Scotland, to the production of fruits, of vegetables, of flowers, of all that variety of objects which are sure to find a market in a rich and wealthy country like this, but which have hitherto been consigned almost exclusively to garden production. You know that in Scotland, in Aberdeenshire—and I am told also in Perthshire—a great example of this kind has been set in the cultivation of strawberries—the cultivation of strawberries is carried on over hundreds of acres at once. I am ashamed, gentlemen, to go further into this matter as if I was attempted to instruct you. I am sure you will take my hint as a respectful hint—I am sure you will take it as a friendly hint. I do not believe that the large properties of this country, generally or universally, can or will be broken up into small ones. I do not believe that the land of this country will be owned as a general rule by those who cultivate it. I believe we shall continue to have, as we have had, a class of landlords and a class of cultivators, but I most earnestly desire to see—not only to see the relations of those classes to one another harmonious and sound, their interests never brought into conflict; but I desire to see both flourishing and prospering, and the soil of my country producing as far as may be under the influence of capital and skill, every variety of product which may give an abundant livelihood to those who live upon it. I say, therefore, gentlemen, and I say it with all respect, I hope for a good deal from the small culture, the culture in use among the small proprietors of France; but I do not look to a fundamental change in the distribution of landed property in this country as a remedy for agricultural distress.

But I go on to another remedy which is proposed, and I do it with a great deal less of respect; nay, I now come to the

region of what I have presumed to call quack remedies. There is a quack remedy which is called Reciprocity, and this quack remedy is under the special protection of quack doctors, and among the quack doctors I am sorry to say there appear to be some in very high station indeed, and if I am rightly informed, no less a person than her Majesty's secretary of state for foreign affairs has been moving about the country and indicating a very considerable expectation that possibly by reciprocity agricultural distress will be relieved. Let me test, gentlemen, the efficacy of this quack remedy for your, in some places, agricultural pressure, and generally distress—the pressure that has been upon you, the struggle in which you are engaged. Pray watch its operation; pray note what is said by the advocates of reciprocity. They always say, We are the soundest and best free-traders. We recommend reciprocity because it is the truly effectual method of bringing about free trade. At present America imposes enormous duties upon our cotton goods and upon our iron goods. Put reciprocity into play and America will become a free-trading country. Very well, gentlemen, how would that operate upon you agriculturists in particular? Why, it would operate thus: If your condition is to be regretted in certain particulars and capable of amendment, I beg you to cast an eye of sympathy upon the condition of the American agriculturist. It has been very well said, and very truly said,—though it is a smart antithesis,—the American agriculturist has got to buy everything that he wants at prices which are fixed in Washington by the legislation of America, but he has got to sell everything that he produces at prices which are fixed in Liverpool—fixed by the free competition of the world. How would you like that, gentlemen—to have protective prices to pay for everything that you use—for your

manures, for your animals, for your implements, for all your farming stock, and at the same time to have to sell what you produce in the free and open market of the world? But bring reciprocity into play, and then if reciprocity doctors are right the Americans will remove all their protective duties, and the American farmer, instead of producing as he does now, under the disadvantage and the heavy disadvantage of having to pay protective prices for everything that constitutes his farming stock, will have all his tools and implements, and manures, and everything else purchased in the free, open market of the world at free-trade prices. So he will be able to produce his corn to compete with you even cheaper than he does now. So much for reciprocity considered as a cure for distress. I am not going to consider it now in any other point of view.

But, gentlemen, there are another set of men who are bolder still, and who are not for reciprocity; who are not content with that milder form of quackery, but who recommend a reversion, pure and simple, to what I may fairly call, I think, the exploded doctrine of protection. And upon this, gentlemen, I think it necessary, if you will allow me, to say to you a few words, because it is a very serious matter, and it is all the more serious because her Majesty's government—I do not scruple to say—are coquetting with this subject in a way which is not right. They are tampering with it; they are playing with it. A protective speech was made in the House of Commons in a debate last year by Mr. Chaplin, on the part of what is called “the agricultural interest.” Mr. Chaplin did not use the word protection, but what he did say was this: He said he demanded that the malt tax should be abolished and the revenue supplied by a tax upon foreign barley or some other foreign commodity. Well, if he has a measure of that kind in his pocket I don't ask him to affix the word protection

to it. I can do that for myself. Not a word of rebuke, gentlemen, was uttered to the doctrines of Mr. Chaplin. He was complimented upon the ability of his speech and the well-chosen terms of his motion. Some of the members of her Majesty's government—the minor members of her Majesty's government—the humbler luminaries of that great constellation—have been going about the country and telling their farming constituents that they think the time has come when a return to protection might very wisely be tried. But, gentlemen, what delusions have been practised upon the unfortunate British farmer! When we go back for twenty years, what is now called the Tory party was never heard of as the Tory party. It was always heard of as the party of protection. As long as the chiefs of the protective party were not in office, as long as they were irresponsible, they recommended themselves to the good will of the farmer as protectionists, and said they would set him up and put his interests on a firm foundation through protection. We brought them into office in the year 1852. I gave with pleasure a vote that assisted to bring them into office. I thought bringing them into office was the only way of putting their professions to the test. They came into office, and before they had been six months in office they had thrown protection to the winds. And that is the way in which the British farmer's expectations are treated by those who claim for themselves in the special sense the designation of his friends.

It is exactly the same with the malt tax. Gentlemen, what is done with the malt tax? The malt tax is held by them to be a great grievance on the British farmer. Whenever a Liberal government is in office, from time to time they have a great muster from all parts of the country to vote for the abolition of the malt tax. But when a Tory government

comes into office, the abolition of the malt tax is totally forgotten; and we have now had six years of a Tory government without a word said, as far as I can recollect,—and my friend in the chair could correct me if I were wrong,—without a motion made, or a vote taken, on the subject of the malt tax. The malt tax, great and important as it is, is small in reference to protection. Gentlemen, it is a very serious matter indeed if we ought to go back to protection, because how did we come out of protection to free trade? We came out of it by a struggle which in its crisis threatened to convulse the country, which occupied Parliaments, upon which elections turned, which took up twenty years of our legislative life, which broke up parties. In a word, it effected a change so serious that if, after the manner in which we effected that change, it be right that we should go back upon our steps, then all I can say is, that we must lose that which has ever been one of the most honorable distinctions of British legislation in the general estimation of the world,—that British legislation, if it moves slowly, always moves in one direction—that we never go back upon our steps.

But are we such children that, after spending twenty years—as I may say from 1840 to 1860—in breaking down the huge fabric of protection, in 1879 we are seriously to set about building it up again? If that be right, gentlemen, let it be done, but it will involve on our part a most humiliating confession. In my opinion it is not right. Protection, however, let me point out, now is asked for in two forms, and I am next going to quote Lord Beaconsfield for the purpose of expressing my concurrence with him.

☞ Mostly, I am bound to say, as far as my knowledge goes, protection has not been asked for by the agricultural interest, certainly not by the farmers of Scotland.

It has been asked for by certain injudicious cliques and classes of persons connected with other industries—connected with some manufacturing industries. They want to have duties laid upon manufactures.

But here Lord Beaconsfield said—and I cordially agree with him—that he would be no party to the institution of a system in which protection was to be given to manufacturers and to be refused to agriculture.

That one-sided protection I deem to be totally intolerable, and I reject it even at the threshold as unworthy of a word of examination or discussion.

But let us go on to two-sided protection and see whether that is any better—that is to say, protection in the shape of duties on manufactures and protection in the shape of duties upon corn, duties upon meat, duties upon butter and cheese and eggs, and every thing that can be produced from the land. Now, gentlemen, in order to see whether we can here find a remedy for our difficulties, I prefer to speculation and mere abstract argument the method of reverting to experience. Experience will give us very distinct lessons upon this matter. We have the power, gentlemen, of going back to the time when protection was in full and unchecked force, and of examining the effect which it produced upon the wealth of the country. How, will you say, do I mean to test that wealth? I mean to test that wealth by the exports of the country and I will tell you why, because your prosperity depends upon the wealth of your customers—that is to say, upon their capacity to buy what you produce. And who are your customers? Your customers are the industrial population of the country who produce what we export and send all over the world. Consequently, when exports increase, your customers are doing a large business, are growing

wealthy, are putting money in their pockets, and are able to take that money out of their pockets in order to fill their stomachs with what you produce. When, on the contrary, exports do not increase, your customers are poor, your prices go down, as you have felt within the last few years in the price of meat, for example, and in other things, and your condition is proportionally depressed. Now, gentlemen, down to the year 1842 no profane hand had been laid upon the august fabric of protection. For recollect that the farmers' friends always told us that it was a very august fabric, and that if you pulled it down it would involve the ruin of the country. That, you remember, was the commonplace of every Tory speech delivered from a country hustings to a farming constituency. But before 1842 another agency had come into force, which gave new life in a very considerable degree to the industry of the country, and that was the agency of railways, of improved communication, which shortened distance and cheapened transit, and effected in that way an enormous economical gain and addition to the wealth of the country. Therefore, in order to see what we owe to our friend protection, I won't allow that friend to take credit for what was done by railways in improving the wealth of the country. I will go to the time when I may say there were virtually no railways—that is the time before 1830. Now, gentlemen, here are the official facts which I shall lay before you in the simplest form, and remember, using round numbers. I do that because, although round numbers cannot be absolutely accurate, they are easy for the memory to take in, and they involve no material error, no falsification of the case. In the year 1800, gentlemen, the exports of British produce were £39,500,000 in value. The population at that time,—no, I won't speak of the exact figure of the

population, because I have not got it for the three kingdoms. In the years 1826 to 1830,—that is, after a medium period of eight and twenty years,—the average of our exports for those five years, which had been £39,500,000 in 1800, was £37,000,000. It is fair to admit that in 1800 the currency was somewhat less sound, and therefore I am quite willing to admit that the £37,000,000 probably meant as much in value as the £39,500,000, but substantially, gentlemen, the trade of the country was stationary, practically stationary, under protection. The condition of the people grew, if possible, rather worse than better. The wealth of the country was nearly stationary. But now I show you what protection produced; that it made no addition, it gave no onward movement to the profits of those who are your customers. But on these profits you depend; because, under all circumstances, gentlemen, this I think nobody will dispute,—a considerable portion of what the Englishman or the Scotchman produces will some way or other find its way down his throat.

What has been the case, gentlemen, since we cast off the superstition of protection, since we discarded the imposture of protection? I will tell you what happened between 1830, when there were no railways, and 1842, when no change, no important change, had been made as to protection, but when the railway system was in operation, hardly in Scotland, but in England to a very great extent, to a very considerable extent upon the main lines of communication. The exports which in 1830 had been somewhere about £37,000,000, between 1840 and 1842 showed an average amount of £50,000,000. That seems due, gentlemen, to the agency of railways; and I wish you to bear in mind the increasing benefit now derived from that agency, in order that I may not claim any undue credit for freedom of trade. From

1842, gentlemen, onward the successive stages of free trade began; in 1842, in 1845, in 1846, in 1853, and again in 1860, the large measures were carried which have completely reformed your customs tariff, and reduced it from a taxation of twelve hundred articles to a taxation of, I think, less than twelve.

Now, under the system of protection, the export trade of the country, the wealth and the power of the manufacturing and producing classes to purchase your agricultural products did not increase at all. In the time when railways began to be in operation, but before free trade, the exports of the country increased, as I have shown you, by £13,000,000 in somewhere about thirteen years—that is to say, taking it roughly, at the rate of £1,000,000 a year.

But since 1842 and down to the present time we have had, along with railways, always increasing their benefits,—we have had the successive adoption of free-trade measures; and what has been the state of the export business of the country? It has risen in this degree, that that which from 1840 to 1842 averaged £50,000,000 from 1873 to 1878 averaged £218,000,000. Instead of increasing, as it has done between 1830 and 1842, when railways only were at work, at the rate of £1,000,000 a year—instead of remaining stagnant as it did when the country was under protection pure and simple, with no augmentation of the export trade to enlarge the means of those who buy your products, the total growth in a period of thirty-five years was no less than £168,000,000, or, taking it roughly, a growth in the export trade of the country to the extent of between £4,000,000 and £5,000,000 a year. But, gentlemen, you know the fact. You know very well that while restriction was in force you did not get the prices that you have been getting for the

last twenty years. The price of wheat has been much the same as it had been before. The price of oats is a better price than was to be had on the average of protective times. But the price, with the exception of wheat, of almost every agricultural commodity, the price of wool, the price of meat, the price of cheese, the price of every thing that the soil produces, has been largely increased in a market free and open to the world; because, while the artificial advantage which you got through protection, as it was supposed to be an advantage, was removed, you were brought into that free and open market, and the energy of free trade so enlarged the buying capacity of your customers that they were willing and able to give you and did give you a great deal more for your meat, your wool, and your products in general, than you would ever have got under the system of protection. Gentlemen, if that be true—and it cannot, I believe, be impeached or impugned—if that be true, I don't think I need further discuss the matter, especially when so many other matters have to be discussed.

I will therefore ask you again to cross the seas with me. I see that the time is flying onward, and, gentlemen, it is very hard upon you to be so much vexed upon the subject of policy abroad. You think generally, and I think, that your domestic affairs are quite enough to call for all your attention. There was a saying of an ancient Greek orator, who unfortunately very much undervalued what we generally call the better portion of the community—namely, women; he made a very disrespectful observation which I am going to quote, not for the purpose of concurring with it, but for the purpose of an illustration.

Pericles, the great Athenian statesman, said with regard to women, their greatest merit was to be never heard of.

Now, what Pericles untruly said of women, I am very much disposed to say of foreign affairs—their great merit would be to be never heard of. Unfortunately, instead of being never heard of, they are always heard of, and you hear almost of nothing else; and I can't promise you, gentlemen, that you will be relieved from this everlasting din, because the consequences of an unwise meddling with foreign affairs are consequences that will for some time necessarily continue to trouble you, and that will find their way to your pockets in the shape of increased taxation.

Gentlemen, with that apology I ask you again to go with me beyond the seas. And as I wish to do full justice I will tell you what I think to be the right principles of foreign policy; and then, as far as your patience and my strength will permit, I will, at any rate for a short time, illustrate those right principles by some of the departures from them that have taken place of late years. I first give you, gentlemen, what I think the right principles of foreign policy.

The first thing is to foster the strength of the empire by just legislation and economy at home, thereby producing two of the great elements of national power—namely, wealth, which is a physical element, and union and contentment, which are the moral elements,—and to reserve the strength of the empire, to reserve the expenditure of that strength, for great and worthy occasion abroad. Here is my first principle of foreign policy: good government at home.

My second principle of foreign policy is this: that its aim ought to be to preserve to the nations of the world—and especially, were it but for shame, when we recollect the sacred name we bear as Christians, especially to the Christian nations of the world—the blessings of peace. That is my second principle.

My third principle is this: Even, gentlemen, when you do a good thing you may do it in so bad a way that you may entirely spoil the beneficial effect; and if we were to make ourselves the apostles of peace in the sense of conveying to the minds of other nations that we thought ourselves more entitled to an opinion on that subject than they are, or to deny their rights—well, very likely we should destroy the whole value of our doctrines. In my opinion the third sound principle is this: to strive to cultivate and maintain, aye, to the very uttermost, what is called the concert of Europe; to keep the powers of Europe in union together. And why? Because by keeping all in union together you neutralize and fetter and bind up the selfish aims of each. I am not here to flatter either England or any of them. They have selfish aims as unfortunately we in late years have too sadly shown that we too have had selfish aims; but their common action is fatal to selfish aims. Common action means common objects; and the only objects for which you can unite together the powers of Europe are objects connected with the common good of them all. That gentlemen is my third principle of foreign policy.

My fourth principle is: that you should avoid needless and entangling engagements. You may boast about them, you may brag about them, you may say you are procuring consideration for the country. You may say that an Englishman can now hold up his head among the nations. You may say that he is now not in the hands of a Liberal ministry, who thought of nothing but pounds, shillings, and pence. But what does all this come to, gentlemen? It comes to this, that you are increasing your engagements without increasing your strength; and if you increase engagements without increasing strength you diminish strength, you abolish strength; you

really reduce the empire and do not increase it. You render it less capable of performing its duties; you render it an inheritance less precious to hand on to future generations.

My fifth principle is this, gentlemen: to acknowledge the equal rights of all nations. You may sympathize with one nation more than another. Nay, you must sympathize in certain circumstances with one nation more than another. You sympathize most with those nations as a rule with which you have the closest connection in language, in blood, and in religion, or whose circumstances at the time seem to give the strongest claim to sympathy. But in point of right all are equal, and you have no right to set up a system under which one of them is to be placed under moral suspicion or espionage, or to be made the constant subject of invective. If you do that, but especially if you claim for yourself a superiority, a pharisaical superiority over the whole of them, then I say you may talk about your patriotism if you please, but you are a misjudging friend of your country, and in undermining the basis of the esteem and respect of other people for your country you are in reality inflicting the severest injury upon it. I have now given you, gentlemen, five principles of foreign policy. Let me give you a sixth and then I have done.

And that sixth is: that in my opinion foreign policy, subject to all the limitations that I have described, the foreign policy of England should always be inspired by the love of freedom. There should be a sympathy with freedom, a desire to give it scope, founded not upon visionary ideas, but upon the long experience of many generations within the shores of this happy isle, that in freedom you lay the firmest foundations both of loyalty and order; the firmest foundations for the development of individual character and the best provision for the happiness of the nation at large.

In the foreign policy of this country the name of Canning ever will be honored. The name of Russell ever will be honored. The name of Palmerston ever will be honored by those who recollect the erection of the kingdom of Belgium and the union of the disjoined provinces of Italy. It is that sympathy, not a sympathy with disorder, but on the contrary founded upon the deepest and most profound love of order,—it is that sympathy which in my opinion ought to be the very atmosphere in which a foreign secretary of England ought to live and to move.

Gentlemen, it is impossible for me to do more to-day than to attempt very slight illustrations of those principles. But in uttering those principles I have put myself in a position in which no one is entitled to tell me—you will hear me out in what I say—that I simply object to the acts of others and lay down no rules of action myself. I am not only prepared to show what are the rules of action which in my judgment are the right rules, but I am prepared to apply them nor will I shrink from their application. I will take, gentlemen, the name which most of all others is associated with suspicion and with alarm and with hatred in the minds of many Englishmen. I will take the name of Russia, and at once I will tell you what I think about Russia, and how I am prepared as a member of Parliament to proceed in anything that respects Russia. You have heard me, gentlemen, denounced sometimes I believe as a Russian spy, sometimes as a Russian agent, sometimes as perhaps a Russian fool, which is not so bad, but still not very desirable. But, gentlemen, when you come to evidence the worst thing that I have ever seen quoted out of any speech or writing of mine about Russia is that I did one day say, or I believe I wrote, these terrible words: I recommended Englishmen to imitate Russia in her good

deeds. Was not that a terrible proposition? I cannot recede from it. I think we ought to imitate Russia in her good deeds, and if the good deeds be few I am sorry for it, but I am not the less disposed on that account to imitate them when they come. I will now tell you what I think just about Russia.

I make it one of my charges against the foreign policy of her Majesty's government that, while they have completely estranged from this country—let us not conceal the fact—the feelings of a nation of eighty millions, for that is the number of the subjects of the Russian empire,—while they have contrived completely to estrange the feelings of that nation they have aggrandized the power of Russia. They have aggrandized the power of Russia in two ways which I will state with perfect distinctness. They have augmented her territory. Before the European powers met at Berlin Lord Salisbury met with Count Schouvaloff, and Lord Salisbury agreed that, unless he could convince Russia by his arguments in the open Congress of Berlin, he would support the restoration to the despotic power of Russia of that country north of the Danube which at the moment constituted a portion of the free state of Roumania. Why, gentlemen, what had been done by the Liberal government which forsooth attended to nothing but pounds, shillings, and pence? The Liberal government had driven Russia back from the Danube. Russia, which was a Danubian power before the Crimean war, lost this position on the Danube by the Crimean war; and the Tory government, which has been incensing and inflaming you against Russia, yet nevertheless by binding itself beforehand to support, when the judgment was taken, the restoration of that country to Russia, has aggrandized the power of Russia.

It further aggrandized the power of Russia in Armenia; but I would not dwell upon that matter if it were not for a very strange circumstance. You know that an Armenian province was given to Russia after the war, but about that I own to you I have very much less feeling of objection. I have objected from the first vehemently and in every form to the granting of territory on the Danube to Russia, and carrying back the population of a certain country from a free state to a despotic state; but with regard to the transfer of a certain portion of the Armenian people from the government of Turkey to the government of Russia I must own that I contemplate that transfer with much greater equanimity. I have no fear myself of the territorial extensions of Russia in Asia, no fear of them whatever. I think the fears are no better than old women's fears. And I don't wish to encourage her aggressive tendencies in Asia or anywhere else. But I admit it may be and probably is the case that there is some benefit attending upon the transfer of a portion of Armenia from Turkey to Russia.

But here is a very strange fact. You know that that portion of Armenia includes the port of Batoum. Lord Salisbury has lately stated to the country that, by the treaty of Berlin the port of Batoum is to be only a commercial port. If the treaty of Berlin stated that it was to be only a commercial port, which of course could not be made an arsenal, that fact would be very important. But happily, gentlemen, although treaties are concealed from us nowadays as long and as often as is possible, the treaty of Berlin is an open instrument. We can consult it for ourselves; and when we consult the treaty of Berlin we find it states that Batoum shall be essentially a commercial port, but not that it shall be only a commercial port. Why, gentlemen, Leith is essentially a

commercial port, but there is nothing to prevent the people of this country if in their wisdom or their folly they should think fit from constituting Leith as a great naval arsenal or fortification; and there is nothing to prevent the Emperor of Russia, while leaving to Batoum a character that shall be essentially commercial, from joining with that another character that is not in the slightest degree excluded by the treaty, and making it as much as he pleases a port of military defence. Therefore I challenge the assertion of Lord Salisbury; and as Lord Salisbury is fond of writing letters to the "Times" to bring the Duke of Argyll to book, he perhaps will be kind enough to write another letter to the "Times" and tell in what clause of the treaty of Berlin he finds it written that the port of Batoum shall be only a commercial port. For the present I simply leave it on record that he has misrepresented the treaty of Berlin.

With respect to Russia I take two views of the position of Russia. The position of Russia in Central Asia I believe to be one that has in the main been forced upon her against her will. She has been compelled—and this is the impartial opinion of the world,—she has been compelled to extend her frontier southward in Central Asia by causes in some degree analogous to, but certainly more stringent and imperative than, the causes which have commonly led us to extend in a far more important manner our frontier in India; and I think it, gentlemen, much to the credit of the late government, much to the honor of Lord Clarendon and Lord Granville that when we were in office we made a covenant with Russia in which Russia bound herself to exercise no influence or interference whatever in Afghanistan, we on the other hand making known our desire that Afghanistan should continue free and independent. Both the powers acted with uniform strict-

ness and fidelity upon this engagement until the day when we were removed from office. But Russia, gentlemen, has another position—her position in respect to Turkey; and here it is that I have complained of the government for aggrandizing the power of Russia; it is on this point that I most complain.

The policy of her Majesty's government was a policy of repelling and repudiating the Slavonic populations of Turkey in Europe and of declining to make England the advocate for their interests. Nay, more; she became in their view the advocate of the interests opposed to theirs. Indeed she was rather the decided advocate of Turkey; and now Turkey is full of loud complaints—and complaints I must say not unjust—that we allured her on to her ruin; that we gave the Turks a right to believe that we should support them; that our ambassadors, Sir Henry Elliot and Sir Austin Layard, both of them said we had most vital interests in maintaining Turkey as it was, and consequently the Turks thought if we had vital interests we should certainly defend them; and they were thereby lured on into that ruinous, cruel, and destructive war with Russia. But by our conduct to the Slavonic populations we alienated those populations from us. We made our name odious among them. They had every disposition to sympathize with us, every disposition to confide in us. They are as a people desirous of freedom, desirous of self-government, with no aggressive views, but hating the idea of being absorbed in a huge despotic empire like Russia. But when they found that we and the other powers of Europe under our unfortunate guidance declined to become in any manner their champions in defence of the rights of life, of property, and of female honor,—when they found that there was no call which could find its way to the heart of England through its govern-

ment or to the hearts of other powers, and that Russia alone was disposed to fight for them, why naturally they said Russia is our friend. We have done everything, gentlemen, in our power to drive these populations into the arms of Russia. If Russia has aggressive dispositions in the direction of Turkey—and I think it probable that she may have them,—it is we who have laid the ground upon which Russia may make her march to the south,—we who have taught the Bulgarians, the Servians, the Roumanians, the Montenegrins, that there is one power in Europe and only one which is ready to support in act and by the sword her professions of sympathy with the oppressed populations of Turkey. That power is Russia, and how can you blame these people if in such circumstances they are disposed to say Russia is our friend? But why did we make them say it? Simply because of the policy of the government, not because of the wishes of the people of this country. Gentlemen, this is the most dangerous form of aggrandizing Russia. If Russia is aggressive anywhere, if Russia is formidable anywhere, it is by movements toward the south, it is by schemes for acquiring command of the straits or of Constantinople; and there is no way by which you can possibly so much assist her in giving reality to these designs as by inducing and disposing the populations of these provinces who are now in virtual possession of them, to look upon Russia as their champion and their friend, to look upon England as their disguised perhaps but yet real and effective enemy.

Why, now, gentlemen, I have said that I think it not unreasonable either to believe or at any rate to admit it to be possible that Russia has aggressive designs in the east of Europe. I do not mean immediate aggressive designs. I do not believe that the Emperor of Russia is a man of aggressive schemes or policy. It is that, looking to that question in the

long run, looking at what has happened and what may happen in ten or twenty years, in one generation, in two generations, it is highly probable that in some circumstances Russia may develop aggressive tendencies toward the south.

Perhaps you will say I am here guilty of the same injustice to Russia that I have been deprecating because I say that we ought not to adopt the method of condemning anybody without cause and setting up exceptional principles in proscription of a particular nation. Gentlemen, I will explain to you in a moment the principle upon which I act and the grounds upon which I form my judgment. They are simply these grounds: I look at the position of Russia, the geographical position of Russia relatively to Turkey. I look at the comparative strength of the two empires; I look at the importance of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus as an exit and a channel for the military and commercial marine of Russia to the Mediterranean; and what I say to myself is this: If the United Kingdom were in the same position relatively to Turkey which Russia holds upon the map of the globe I feel quite sure that we should be very apt indeed both to entertain and to execute aggressive designs upon Turkey. Gentlemen, I will go further and will frankly own to you that I believe if we, instead of happily inhabiting this island, had been in the possession of the Russian territory and in the circumstances of the Russian people we should most likely have eaten up Turkey long ago. And consequently in saying that Russia ought to be vigilantly watched in that quarter I am only applying to her the rule which in parallel circumstances I feel convinced ought to be applied and would be justly applied to judgments upon our own country.

Gentlemen, there is only one other point on which I must still say a few words to you, although there are a great many

upon which I have a great many words yet to say somewhere or other.

Of all the principles, gentlemen, of foreign policy which I have enumerated that to which I attach the greatest value is the principle of the equality of nations; because without recognizing that principle there is no such thing as public right and without public international right there is no instrument available for settling the transactions of mankind except material force. Consequently the principle of equality among nations lies in my opinion at the very basis and root of a Christian civilization, and when that principle is compromised or abandoned with it must depart our hopes of tranquillity and of progress for mankind.

I am sorry to say, gentlemen, that I feel it my absolute duty to make this charge against the foreign policy under which we have lived for the last two years, since the resignation of Lord Derby. It has been a foreign policy in my opinion wholly, or to a perilous extent, unregardful of public right and it has been founded upon the basis of a false, I think an arrogant and a dangerous, assumption, although I do not question its being made conscientiously and for what was believed the advantage of the country,—an untrue, arrogant, and dangerous assumption that we are entitled to assume for ourselves some dignity which we should also be entitled to withhold from others and to claim on our own part authority to do things which we would not permit to be done by others. For example when Russia was going to the Congress at Berlin we said: “Your treaty of San Stefano is of no value. It is an act between you and Turkey; but the concerns of Turkey by the treaty of Paris are the concerns of Europe at large. We insist upon it that the whole of your treaty of San Stefano shall be submitted to the Congress at

Berlin that they may judge how far to open it in each and every one of its points, because the concerns of Turkey are the common concerns of the powers of Europe acting in concert."

Having asserted that principle to the world what did we do? These two things, gentlemen: secretly, without the knowledge of Parliament, without even the forms of official procedure, Lord Salisbury met Count Schouvaloff in London and agreed with him upon the terms on which the two powers together should be bound in honor to one another to act upon all the most important points when they came before the Congress at Berlin. Having alleged against Russia that she should not be allowed to settle Turkish affairs with Turkey because they were but two powers and these affairs were the common affairs of Europe and of European interest, we then got Count Schouvaloff into a private room, and on the part of England and Russia, they being but two powers, we settled a large number of the most important of these affairs in utter contempt and derogation of the very principle for which the government had been contending for months before, for which they had asked Parliament to grant a sum of £6,000,000, for which they had spent that £6,000,000 in needless and mischievous armaments. That which we would not allow Russia to do with Turkey, because we pleaded the rights of Europe, we ourselves did with Russia, in contempt of the rights of Europe. Nor was that all, gentlemen. That act was done, I think, on one of the last days of May, in the year 1878, and the document was published, made known to the world, made known to the Congress at Berlin, to its infinite astonishment unless I am very greatly misinformed.

But that was not all. Nearly at the same time we performed the same operation in another quarter. We objected to a treaty between Russia and Turkey as having no authority,

though that treaty was made in the light of day—namely, to the treaty of San Stefano; and what did we do? We went not in the light of day but in the darkness of the night,—not in the knowledge and cognizance of other powers, all of whom would have had the faculty and means of watching all along and of preparing and taking their own objections and shaping their own policy,—not in the light of day, but in the darkness of the night, we sent the ambassador of England in Constantinople to the minister of Turkey and there he framed, even while the Congress of Berlin was sitting to determine these matters of common interest, he framed that which is too famous, shall I say, or rather too notorious, as the Anglo-Turkish convention.

Gentlemen, it is said and said truly that truth beats fiction; that what happens in fact from time to time is of a character so daring, so strange, that if the novelist were to imagine it and put it upon his pages the whole world would reject it from its improbability. And that is the case of the Anglo-Turkish convention. For who would have believed it possible that we should assert before the world the principle that Europe only could deal with the affairs of the Turkish empire and should ask Parliament for six millions to support us in asserting that principle, should send ministers to Berlin who declared that unless that principle was acted upon they would go to war with the material that Parliament had placed in their hands and should at the same time be concluded a separate agreement with Turkey, under which those matters of European jurisdiction were coolly transferred to English jurisdiction; and the whole matter was sealed with the worthless bribe of the possession and administration of the island of Cyprus! I said, gentlemen, the worthless bribe of the island of Cyprus, and that is the truth. It is worthless for our purposes—not

worthless in itself; an island of resources, an island of natural capabilities, provided they are allowed to develop themselves in the course of circumstances without violent and unprincipled methods of action. But Cyprus was not thought to be worthless by those who accepted it as a bribe. On the contrary you were told that it was to secure the road to India; you were told that it was to be the site of an arsenal very cheaply made and more valuable than Malta; you were told that it was to revive trade. And a multitude of companies were formed and sent agents and capital to Cyprus and some of them, I fear, grievously burned their fingers there. I am not going to dwell upon that now. What I have in view is not the particular merits of Cyprus, but the illustration that I have given you in the case of the agreement of Lord Salisbury with Count Schouvaloff and in the case of the Anglo-Turkish convention, of the manner in which we have asserted for ourselves a principle that we had denied to others—namely, the principle of overriding the European authority of the treaty of Paris and taking the matters which that treaty gave to Europe into our own separate jurisdiction.

Now, gentlemen, I am sorry to find that that which I call the pharisaical assertion of our own superiority has found its way alike into the practice and seemingly into the theories of the government. I am not going to assert anything which is not known, but the prime minister has said that there is one day in the year—namely, the 9th of November, Lord Mayor's day—on which the language of sense and truth is to be heard amidst the surrounding din of idle rumors generated and fledged in the brains of irresponsible scribes. I do not agree, gentlemen, in that panegyric upon the 9th of November. I am much more apt to compare the 9th of November—certainly a well-known day in the year—but as to some of the

speeches that have lately been made upon it I am very much disposed to compare it with another day in the year well known to British tradition and that other day in the year is the 1st of April. But, gentlemen, on that day the prime minister, speaking out,—I do not question for a moment his own sincere opinion,—made what I think one of the most unhappy and ominous allusions ever made by a minister of this country. He quoted certain words easily rendered as “Empire and Liberty”—words (he said) of a Roman statesman, words descriptive of the state of Rome—and he quoted them as words which were capable of legitimate application to the position and circumstances of England. I join issue with the prime minister upon that subject and I affirm that nothing can be more fundamentally unsound, more practically ruinous, than the establishment of Roman analogies for the guidance of British policy. What, gentlemen, was Rome? Rome was indeed an imperial state, you may tell me,—I know not, I cannot read the counsels of Providence,—a state having a mission to subdue the world, but a state whose very basis it was to deny the equal rights, to proscribe the independent existence of other nations. That, gentlemen, was the Roman idea. It has been partially and not ill described in three lines of a translation from Virgil by our great poet Dryden, which runs as follows:

“O Rome! ’tis thine alone with awful sway
To rule mankind, and make the world obey,
Disposing peace and war thine own majestic way.”

We are told to fall back upon this example. No doubt the word “empire” was qualified with the word “liberty.” But what did the two words “liberty” and “empire” mean in a Roman mouth? They meant simply this: “Liberty for ourselves, empire over the rest of mankind.”

I do not think, gentlemen, that this ministry or any other ministry is going to place us in the position of Rome. What I object to is the revival of the idea. I care not how feebly, I care not even how, from a philosophic or historical point of view, how ridiculous the attempt at this revival may be. I say it indicates an intention—I say it indicates a frame of mind, and the frame of mind unfortunately I find has been consistent with the policy of which I have given you some illustrations—the policy of denying to others the rights that we claim ourselves. No doubt, gentlemen, Rome may have had its work to do and Rome did its work. But modern times have brought a different state of things. Modern times have established a sisterhood of nations, equal, independent, each of them built up under that legitimate defence which public law affords to every nation, living within its own borders and seeking to perform its own affairs; but if one thing more than another has been detestable to Europe it has been the appearance upon the stage from time to time of men who, even in the times of Christian civilization, have been thought to aim at universal dominion. It was this aggressive disposition on the part of Louis XIV, King of France, that led your forefathers, gentlemen, freely to spend their blood and treasure in a cause not immediately their own and to struggle against the method of policy which, having Paris for its centre, seemed to aim at an universal monarchy.

It was the very same thing a century and a half later which was the charge launched and justly launched against Napoleon, that under his dominion France was not content even with her extended limits, but Germany, and Italy, and Spain, apparently without any limit to this pestilent and pernicious process, were to be brought under the dominion or influence of France and national equality was to be trampled under foot

and national rights denied. For that reason England in the struggle almost exhausted herself, greatly impoverished her people, brought upon herself and Scotland too the consequences of a debt that nearly crushed their energies, and poured forth their best blood without limit in order to resist and put down these intolerable pretensions.

Gentlemen, it is but in a pale and weak and almost despicable miniature that such ideas are now set up, but you will observe that the poison lies—that the poison and the mischief lie—in the principle and not the scale.

It is the opposite principle which I say has been compromised by the action of the ministry and which I call upon you and upon any who choose to hear my views to vindicate when the day of our election comes; I mean the sound and the sacred principle that Christendom is formed of a band of nations who are united to one another in the bonds of right; that they are without distinction of great and small; there is an absolute equality between them,—the same sacredness defends the narrow limits of Belgium as attaches to the extended frontiers of Russia or Germany or France. I hold that he who by act or word brings that principle into peril or disparagement, however honest his intentions may be, places himself in the position of one inflicting—I won't say intending to inflict—I ascribe nothing of the sort—but inflicting injury upon his own country and endangering the peace and all the most fundamental interests of Christian society.

ON THE BEACONSFIELD MINISTRY

DELIVERED IN EDINBURGH, MARCH 17, 1880

GENTLEMEN,—When I last had the honor of addressing you in this hall I endeavored in some degree to open the great case which I was in hopes would, in conformity with what I may call constitutional usage, then have been brought at once before you. The arguments which we made for a dissolution were received with the usual contempt, and the Parliament was summoned to attempt for the first time in our history the regular business of a seventh session. I am not going now to argue on the propriety of this course, because, meeting you here in the capital of the county and of Scotland, I am anxious to go straight to the very heart of the matter, and amidst the crowd of topics that rush upon the mind to touch upon some of those which you will judge to be most closely and most intimately connected with the true merits of the great issue that is before us.

At last the dissolution has come, and I postpone the consideration of the question why it has come, the question how it has come, on which there are many things to be said. It has come, and you are about to give your votes upon an occasion which, allow me to tell you, entails not only upon me, but upon you, a responsibility greater than you ever had to undergo. I believe that I have the honor of addressing a mixed meeting, a meeting principally and very largely composed of freeholders of the county, but in which warm and decided friends are freely mingled with those who have not

declared in our favor, or even with those who may intend to vote against us.

Now, gentlemen, let me say a word in the first place to those whom I must for the moment call opponents. I am not going to address them in the language of flattery. I am not going to supplicate them for the conferring of a favor. I am not going to appeal to them on any secondary or any social ground. I am going to speak to them as Scotchmen and as citizens; I am going to speak to them of the duty that they owe to the empire at this moment; I am going to speak to them of the condition of the empire, of the strength of the empire, and of the honor of the empire; and it is upon these issues that I respectfully ask for their support. I am glad that, notwithstanding my Scotch blood, and notwithstanding the association of my father and my grandfather with this country, it is open to our opponents if they like to describe me as a stranger; because I am free to admit that I stand here in consequence of an invitation, and in consequence of treatment the most generous and the most gratifying that ever was accorded to man. And I venture to assure every one of my opponents that if I beg respectfully to have some credit for upright motives, that credit I at once accord to them. I know very well they are not accustomed to hear it given me; I know very well that in the newspapers which they read they will find that violent passion, that outrageous hatred, that sordid greed for office, are the motives and the only motives by which I am governed. Many of these papers constitute in some sense their daily food; but I have such faith in their intelligence, and in the healthiness of their constitution as Scotchmen, that I believe that many of them will by the inherent vigor of that constitution correct and neutralize the poison thus administered; will consent to meet

me upon equal grounds, and will listen to the appeal which I make.

The appeal which I make to them is this: If my position here is a serious one, their position is serious too. My allegations have been before you for a length of time. I will not now again read to a Midlothian audience the letter in which I first accepted this candidature. By every word of that letter I abide; in support of every allegation which that letter contains, I am ready to bring detailed and conclusive proof. These allegations—I say to you, gentlemen, to that portion of my audience—these allegations are of the most serious character. I admit as freely as you can urge that if they be unfounded, then my responsibility—nay, my culpability—before my country cannot be exaggerated. But, on the other hand, if these allegations be true—if it be true that the resources of Great Britain have been misused; if it be true that the international law of Europe has been broken; if it be true that the law of this country has been broken; if it be true that the good name of this land has been tarnished and defaced; if it be true that its condition has been needlessly aggravated by measures both useless, and wanton, and mischievous in themselves—then your responsibility is as great as mine. For I fully admit that in 1874 you incurred no great or special responsibility. You were tired of the Liberal government; you were dissatisfied with them. [Cries of “No, no!”] Oh, I beg pardon; I am addressing my opponents. Scotchmen, I believe, as much as Englishmen, like plain speaking, and I hope I have given you some proof that if that be your taste I endeavor to meet it as well as I can; and I thank you heartily for the manner in which, by your kindly attention, you have enabled me to say what I think is the truth, whether it be palatable or whether it be not.

Now the great question which we have been debating for the last three or four years—for I do not carry back the pith of what I have principally to say to the six years of the government—is the question of the policy which has been pursued during that time; most especially by far the policy of the last two years, and the effect of that policy upon the condition of the country, upon the legislation of the country, upon the strength of the empire, and above all upon the honor of the empire. I am now going to compare the conduct of the present government, which is commended to you as masterly in forethought and sagacity and truly English in spirit—I am going to compare it with the conduct of the last government and to lay before you the proceedings of the results. It so happens that their histories are a not inconvenient means of comparison. England, as you are aware, has been involved in many guarantees. I said England—do not be shocked; it is the shortest word—Great Britain or the United Kingdom is what one ought to say. The United Kingdom—the British empire—has been and is involved in many guarantees for the condition of other countries. Among others, we were involved, especially since the Peace of Paris, but also before the Peace of Paris, in a guarantee for Turkey, aiming to maintain its integrity and its independence; and we were involved in another guarantee for Belgium, aiming to maintain its integrity and its independence. In the time of the present government the integrity and the independence of Turkey were menaced—menaced by the consequences of rank, festering corruption from within. In the time of the late government the integrity and independence of Belgium were not less seriously menaced. We had been living in perfect harmony and friendship with two great military states of Europe—with

Prussia and with France. France and Prussia came into conflict, and at the moment of their coming into conflict a document was revealed to us which the ministers of those two states had had in their hands. Whoever was its author, whoever was its promoter, that is no affair of mine—it is due to Prince Bismarck to say that he was the person who brought it to light—but they had in their hands an instrument of a formal character, touching a subject that was considered and entertained. And that bad instrument was an instrument for the destruction of the freedom, independence, and integrity of Belgium. Could there be a graver danger to Europe than that?

Here was a State—not like Turkey, the scandal of the world, and the danger of the world from misgovernment, and from the horrible degradation it inflicted upon its subject races—but a country which was a marvel to all Europe for the peaceful exercise of the rights of freedom, and for progress in all the arts and all pursuits that tend to make mankind good and happy. And this country, having nothing but its weakness that could be urged against it, with its four or five millions of people, was deliberately pointed out by somebody and indicated to be destroyed, to be offered up as a sacrifice to territorial lust by one or other of those ministers of powers with whom we were living in close friendship and affection. We felt called upon to enlist ourselves on the part of the British nation as advocates and as champions of the integrity and independence of Belgium. And if we had gone to war we should have gone to war for freedom, we should have gone to war for public right, we should have gone to war to save human happiness from being invaded by tyrannous and lawless power. This is what I call a good cause, gentlemen. And though I detest war, and there are no epithets too strong,

if you could supply me with them, that I will not endeavor to heap upon its head—in such a war as that, while the breath in my body is continued to me, I am ready to engage. I am ready to support it, I am ready to give all the help and aid I can to those who carry this country into it. Well, gentlemen, pledged to support the integrity and independence of Belgium, what did we do? We proposed to Prussia to enter into a new and solemn treaty with us to resist the French empire, if the French empire attempted to violate the sanctity of freedom in Belgium; and we proposed to France to enter into a similar treaty with us to pursue exactly the same measures against Prussia, if Prussia should make the like nefarious attempt. And we undertook that, in concert with the one, or in concert with the other, whichever the case might be, we would pledge all the resources of this empire, and carry it into war for the purpose of resisting mischief and maintaining the principles of European law and peace.

I ask you whether it is not ridiculous to apply the doctrine or the imputation, if it be an imputation, that we belong to the “Manchester School,” or to a Peace Party—we who made these engagements to go to war with France if necessary, or to go to war with Prussia if necessary, for the sake of the independence of Belgium? But now I want you to observe the upshot. I must say that in one respect we were very inferior to the present government—very inferior indeed. Our ciphers, our figures, were perfectly contemptible. We took nothing except two millions of money. We knew perfectly well that what was required was an indication, and that that indication would be quite intelligible when it was read in the light of the new treaty engagement which we were contracting; and consequently we asked Parliament to

give us two millions of money for the sake of somewhat enlarging the numbers of available soldiers, and we were quite prepared to meet that contingency had it arrived. The great man who directs the councils of the German empire [Bismarck] acted with his usual promptitude. Our proposal went to him by telegraph and he answered by telegraph, "Yes," the same afternoon. We were not quite so fortunate with France, for at that time the councils of France were under the domination of some evil genius which it is difficult to trace and needless to attempt to trace. There was some delay in France—a little unnecessary haggling—but after two or three days France also came into this engagement, and from that moment the peace of Belgium was perfectly secured. When we had our integrity and our independence to protect we took the measures which we believed to be necessary and sufficient for that protection; and in every year since those measures, Belgium, not unharmed only, but strengthened by having been carried safely and unhurt through a terrible danger, has pursued her peaceful career, rising continually in her prosperity and happiness, and still holding out an example before all Europe to teach the nations how to live.

Well, gentlemen, as that occasion came to us with respect to Belgium so it came to our successors with respect to Turkey. How did they manage it? They thought themselves bound to maintain the integrity and independence of Turkey, and they were undoubtedly bound conditionally to maintain it. I am not now going into the question of right, but into the question of the adaptation of the means to an end. These are the gentlemen who are set before you as the people whose continuance in office it is necessary to maintain to attract the confidence of Europe; these are the gentlemen

whom patriotic associations laud to the skies as if they had a monopoly of human intelligence; these are the gentlemen who bring you "Peace with Honor"; these are the gentlemen who go in special trains to attend august assemblies and receive the compliments of august statesmen; these are the gentlemen who for all these years have been calling upon you to pay any number of millions that might be required as a very cheap and insignificant consideration for the immense advantages that you derive from their administration.

Therefore I want you to know, and I have shown you, how we set about to maintain integrity and independence, and how it was maintained then. I ask how they have set about it. But, gentlemen, on their own showing they have done wrong. We have it out of their own mouths. I won't go to Lord Derby; I will go to the only man whose authority is higher for this purpose than Lord Derby's, namely, Lord Beaconsfield. He tells you plainly that what the government ought to have done was to have said to Russia, "You shall not invade Turkey." Gentlemen, that course is intelligible. It is a guilty course, in my opinion, to have taken up arms for maintaining the integrity of Turkey against her subject races, or to take up arms against what the Emperor of Russia believed to be a great honor to humanity in going to apply a remedy to these mischiefs. But Lord Beaconsfield has confessed in a public speech that the proper course for the government to have taken was to have planted their foot and to have said to the Emperor of Russia: "Cross not the Danube; if you cross the Danube, expect to confront the power of England on the southern shore." Now, gentlemen, that course is intelligible, perfectly intelligible; and if you are prepared for the responsibility of maintaining such an integrity and such an independence irrespectively of

other considerations against the Christian races in Turkey, that was the course for you to pursue. It was not pursued, because the agitation, which is called the Bulgarian agitation, was too inconvenient to allow the government to pursue it, because they saw that if they did that which Lord Beaconsfield now tells us it would have been right to do, the sentiment of the country would not have permitted them to continue to hold their office; and hence came that vacillation, hence came that ineptitude of policy which they now endeavor to cover by hectoring and by boasting, and which, within the last year or two, they have striven, and not quite unsuccessfully, to hide from the eyes of many by carrying measures of violence into other lands, if not against Russia, if not against the strong, yet against the weak, and endeavoring to attract to themselves the credit and glory of maintaining the power and influence of England.

Well, gentlemen, they were to maintain the integrity and independence of Turkey. How did they set about it? They were not satisfied with asking for our humble two millions; they asked for six millions. What did they do, first of all? First of all they encouraged Turkey to go to war. They did not counsel Turkey's submission to superior force; they neither would advise her to submit, nor would they assist her to resist. They were the great causes of her plunging into that deplorable and ruinous war, from the consequences of which, her Majesty's speech states this year, Turkey has not yet recovered, and there is not the smallest appearance of hope that she will ever recover. But afterwards, and when the war had taken place, they came and asked you for a vote of six millions. What did they do with the six millions? They flourished it in the face of the world. What did they gain for Turkey? In the first place, they sent a fleet to the

Dardanelles and the Bosphorus. Are you aware that in sending that fleet they broke the law of Europe? They applied for a firman to the Sultan. The Sultan refused, and they had no right to send that fleet. But, however that may be, what was the use of sending that fleet? The consequence was that the Russian army, which had been at a considerable distance from Constantinople, marched close up to Constantinople. Is it possible to conceive an idea more absurd than that which I really believe was entertained by many of our friends—I do not say our friends in Midlothian, but in places where the intelligence is high—that the presence of certain British ironclads in the Sea of Marmora prevented the victorious Russian armies from entering Constantinople? What could these ironclads do? They could have battered down Constantinople no doubt; but what consolation would that have been to Turkey, or how would it have prevented Russian armies from entering? That part of the pretext set is too thin and threadbare to require any confutation. But they may say that that vote of six millions was an indication of the intention of England to act in case of need; and when it was first proposed it was to strengthen the hands of England at the Congress. But did it strengthen the hands of England; and if so, to what purpose was that strength used? The treaty of San Stefano had been signed between Russia and Turkey; the treaty of Berlin was substituted for it. What was the grand difference between the treaty of Berlin and the treaty of San Stefano? There was a portion of Bessarabia which, down to the time of the treaty of Berlin, enjoyed free institutions, and by the treaty of Berlin, and mainly through the agency of the British government, which had pledged itself beforehand by what is called the Salisbury-Schouvaloff Memorandum, to support Russia in her demand

for that territory if Russia adhered to that demand, England, with the vote of six millions given to strengthen her influence, made herself specially responsible for handing back that territory, which enjoyed free institutions, to be governed despotically by the Russian empire.

That is the first purpose for which, as I have shown you, your vote of six millions was available. What was the second? It was to draw a line along the Balkan Mountains, by means of which northern Bulgaria was separated from southern Bulgaria, and southern Bulgaria was re-named eastern Roumelia. The Sultan has not marched and cannot march a man into eastern Roumelia. If he did the consequences would be that the whole of that population, who are determined to fight for their rights, would rise against him and his troops, and would be supported by other forces that could be drawn to it under the resistless influences of sympathy with freedom. You may remember that three or four years ago utter scorn was poured upon what was called the "bag-and-baggage policy." Are you aware that that policy is at this moment the basis upon which are regulated the whole of the civil state of things in Bulgaria and eastern Roumelia? What that policy asked was that every Turkish authority should be marched out of Bulgaria, and every Turkish authority has gone out of Bulgaria. There is not a Turk at this moment who, as a Turk, holds office under the Sultan either in Bulgaria or in southern Bulgaria, which is called eastern Roumelia—no, not one. The despised "bag-and-baggage policy" is at this moment the law of Europe, and that is the result of it; and it is for that, gentlemen, that the humble individual who stands before you was held up and reviled as a visionary enthusiast and a verbose—I forget what—rhetorician, although I believe myself there was not much

verbosity in that particular phrase. It appeared to me the people of England understood it pretty well—nay, more, the Congress of Berlin seemed to have understood it, and the state of things which I recommended was irresistible, and now, I thank God, is irreversibly established in those once unhappy provinces. Gentlemen, we have got one more thing to do in regard to these provinces and that is this—I urged it at the same time when I produced this monstrous conception of the “bag-and-baggage policy”—it is this, to take great care that the majority of the inhabitants of these provinces, who are Christians, do not oppress either the Mohammedans, or the Jewish, or any other minority. That is a sacred duty; I don’t believe it to be a difficult duty; it is a sacred duty. I stated to you just now that there was not a Turk holding office as a Turk in these provinces. I believe there are Turks holding office—and I rejoice to hear it—holding office through the free suffrage of their countrymen, and by degrees I hope that they, when they are once rid of all the pestilent and poisonous associations, and the recollections of the old ascendancy, will become good and peaceful citizens like other people. I believe the people of Turkey have in them many fine qualities, whatever the governors may be, capable under proper education, gentlemen, of bringing them to a state of capacity and competency for every civil duty.

Gentlemen, it still remains for me to ask you how this great and powerful government has performed its duty of maintaining the integrity and independence of Turkey. It has had great and extraordinary advantages. It has had the advantage of disciplined support from its majority in the House of Commons. Though I am not making any complaint, as my friend in the chair knows, it was not exactly the same as happened in the days of recent Liberal govern-

ments. It had had unflinching and incessant support from the large majority of the Lords. That was very far from being our case in our day. There is no reason why I should not say so. I say freely—it is an historical fact—that the House of Lords, when the people's representatives are backed by a strong national feeling, when it would be dangerous to oppose, confront, or resist, then the House of Lords pass our measures. So they passed the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, and so they passed the Irish Land Act; and I have no doubt that, if it pleases the Almighty, they will pass many more good measures. But the moment the people go to sleep—and they cannot be always awake—when public opinion flags and ceases to take a strong and decided interest in public questions, that moment the majority of the House of Lords grows. They mangle, they postpone, they reject the good measures that go up to them.

I will show you another advantage which the present administration possesses. They are supported by several foreign governments. Did you read in the London papers within the last few weeks an account of the energetic support they derived from the Emperor of Austria? Did you see that the Emperor of Austria sent for the British Ambassador, Sir Henry Elliot, and told him that a pestilent person, a certain individual named Mr. Gladstone, was a man who did not approve the foreign policy of Austria, and how anxious he was—so the Emperor of Austria was pleased complacently to say—for the guidance of the British people and of the electors of Midlothian—how anxious he was that you should, all of you, give your votes in a way to maintain the Ministry of Lord Beaconsfield.¹ Well, gentlemen, if you approve the

¹ Subsequent disclosures proved that this was not strictly correct, and Mr. Gladstone apologetically withdrew the statement.

foreign policy of Austria, the foreign policy that Austria has usually pursued, I advise you to do that very thing; if you want to have an Austrian foreign policy dominant in the councils of this country, give your votes as the Emperor of Austria recommends. What has that foreign policy of Austria been? I do not say that Austria is incurable. I hope it will yet be cured, because it has got better institutions at home, and I heartily wish it well if it makes honest attempts to confront its difficulties. Yet I must look to what that policy has been. Austria has ever been the unflinching foe of freedom in every country of Europe. Austria trampled under foot, Austria resisted the unity of Germany. Russia, I am sorry to say, has been the foe of freedom too; but in Russia there is an exception—Russia has been the friend of Slavonic freedom; but Austria has never been the friend even of Slavonic freedom. Austria did all she could to prevent the creation of Belgium. Austria never lifted a finger for the regeneration and constitution of Greece. There is not an instance—there is not a spot upon the whole map where you can lay your finger and say, “There Austria did good.” I speak of its general policy; I speak of its general tendency. I do not abandon the hope of improvement in the future, but we must look to the past and to the present for the guidance of our judgments at this moment. And in the Congress of Berlin Austria resisted the extension of freedom and did not promote it; and therefore I say, if you want the spirit of Austria to inspire the councils of this country in Heaven’s name take the Emperor’s counsel; and I advise you to lift the Austrian flag when you go about your purposes of canvass or of public meetings. It will best express the purpose you have in view, and I for one cannot complain of your consistency, whatever in that case I might think of

the tendency of your views in respect of principle, of justice, of the happiness of mankind, or of the greatness, the dignity, and the honor of this great empire.

But, gentlemen, still one word more, because I have not spoken of what has been the upshot of all this. There are a great many persons in this country, I am afraid, as well as in other countries, who are what is called Worshippers of Success, and at the time of the famous "Peace with Honor" demonstration there was a very great appearance of success. I was not myself at that time particularly safe when I walked in the streets of London.¹ I have walked with my wife from my own house, I have walked owing my protection to the police; but that was the time, gentlemen, when all those curious methods of maintaining British honor and British dignity were supposed to have been wonderfully successful. And now I want to ask you, as I have shown you the way we went about maintaining the independence and integrity of Belgium—what has become of the independence and integrity of Turkey? I have shown that they neither knew in the first instance the ends toward which they should first have directed their efforts, nor, when they have chosen ends, have they been able rationally to adapt their means to the attainment of those ends. I am not speaking of the moral character of the means, but how they are adapted to the end. And what did the vote of six millions achieve for Turkey? I will tell you what it achieved. It did achieve one result, and I want you well to consider whether you are satisfied with it or not, especially those of you who are Conservatives. It undoubtedly cut down largely the division of Bulgaria, established by the treaty of

¹At the time of the "Jingo" excitement Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone were hustled by a gang of rowdies in Cavendish Square, and were saved only from violence by taking refuge in the house of Dr., afterwards Sir Andrew, Clark.

San Stefano. Now, I am not going to maintain that that division was a right one, for that depends on a knowledge more minute than I possess; but the effect of it was to cut it down, as is perfectly well known—that is, put back under the direct rule of the Sultan of Turkey, and in the exact condition in which all European Turkey, except the Principalities, had been before the war, the population inhabiting the country of Macedonia, and about a million of people, the vast majority of them Christians. Two substantive and definite results, the two most definite results, produced were these—first of all that Bessarabia, that had been a country with free institutions, was handed back to despotism; and secondly a million and a half of people inhabiting Macedonia, to whom free institutions had been promised by the treaty of San Stefano, are now again placed under the Turkish pashas and have not received one grain of benefit of importance as compared with their condition before the war.

But how as regards Turkey? I have shown results bad enough in regard to freedom. What did the British plenipotentiaries say at Berlin? They said that some people seemed to suppose we had come to cut and carve Turkey. That is quite a mistake, said the plenipotentiaries; we have come to consolidate Turkey. Some of the scribes of the foreign office coined a new word, and said it was to “rejuvenate” Turkey. How did they rejuvenate this unfortunate empire, this miserable empire, this unhappy government which they have lured into war and allowed and encouraged to pass into war because they allowed their ambassadors at Constantinople, Sir Henry Elliot and Sir Austen Layard, to whisper into the ear of the Turk that British interests would compel us to interfere and help her? What has been the result to Turkey? Now, I will say, much as the Christian populations have the right to com-

plain, the Sultan of Turkey has a right to complain very little less. How has the Sultan been treated? We condescended to obtain from him the island of Cyprus, at a time when Austria was pulling at him on one side and freedom on the other. We condescended to take from him that miserable paltry share of the spoil. That is not all. What is the condition of Turkey in Europe? It is neither integrity nor independence. The Sultan is liable to interference at any moment, at every point of his territory, from every one that signed the treaty of Berlin. He has lost ten millions of subjects altogether, ten millions more are in some kind of dependence or other—in a condition that the Sultan does not know whether they will be his subjects to-morrow or the next day. Albania is possessed by a league. Macedonia, as you read in the papers, is traversed by brigands. Thessaly and Epirus, according to the treaty of Berlin, should be given to Greece. The treasury of Turkey is perfectly empty, disturbances have spread through Turkey in Asia, and the condition of that government whose integrity and independence you were told that “Peace with Honor” had secured, is more miserable than at any previous period of its history; and wise and merciful indeed would be the man that would devise some method of improving it.

To those gentlemen who talk of the great vigor and determination and success of the Tory government, I ask you to compare the case of Belgium and Turkey. Try them by principles, or try them by results, I care not which, we knew what we were about and what was to be done when we had integrity and independence to support. When they had integrity and independence to protect they talked indeed loud enough about supporting Turkey, and you would suppose they were prepared to spend their whole resources upon it; but all

their measures have ended in nothing except that they have reduced Turkey to a state of greater weakness than at any portion of her history, whereas, on the other hand, in regard to the twelve or thirteen millions of Slavs and Roumanian population, they have made the name of England odious throughout the whole population, and done everything in their power to throw that population into the arms of Russia, to be the tool of Russia in its plans and schemes, unless indeed, as I hope and am inclined to believe, the virtue of free institutions they have obtained will make them too wise to become the tools of any foreign power whatever, will make them intent upon maintaining their own liberties, as becomes a free people playing a noble part in the history of Europe.

I have detained you too long, and I will not, though I would, pursue this subject further. I have shown you what I think the miserable failure of the policy of the government. Remember we have a fixed point from which to draw our measurements. Remember what in 1876 the proposal of those who approved of the Bulgarian agitation and who were denounced as the enemies of Turkey, remember what that proposal would have done. It would have given autonomy to Bulgaria, which has now got autonomy; but it would have saved all the remainder at less detriment to the rest of the Turkish Empire. Turkey would have had a fair chance. Turkey would not have suffered the territorial losses which she has elsewhere suffered, and which she has suffered, I must say, in consequence of her being betrayed into the false and mischievous, the tempting and seductive, but unreal and unwise policy of the present administration.

There are other matters which must be reserved for other times. We are told about the Crimean War. Sir Stafford Northcote tells us the Crimean War, made by the Liberal

government, cost the country forty millions of debt, and an income tax of one shilling and four pence per pound. Now what is the use of telling us that? I will discuss the Crimean War on some future occasion, but not now. If the Liberal government were so clever that they contrived to burden the country with forty millions of debt for this Crimean War, why does he not go back to the war before that and tell us what the Tory government did with the Revolutionary War, when they left a debt on the country of some nine hundred millions, of which six hundred and fifty millions they had made in the Revolutionary War, and not only so, but left the blessing and legacy of the corn laws, and of a high protective system, an impoverished country, and a discontented population—so much so that for years that followed that great Revolutionary War, no man could say whether the constitution of this country was or was not worth five years' purchase. They might even go further back than the Revolutionary War. They have been talking loudly of the colonies, and say that, forsooth, the Liberal party do nothing for the colonies. What did the Tory party do for the colonies? I can tell you. Go to the war that preceded the Revolutionary War. They made war against the American continent. They added to the debt of the country two hundred millions in order to destroy freedom in America. They alienated it and drove it from this country. They were compelled to bring this country to make an ignominious peace; and, as far as I know, that attempt to put down freedom in America, with its results to this country, is the only one great fact which has ever distinguished the relations between a Tory government and the colonies.

But, gentlemen, these must be matters postponed for another occasion. I thank you very cordially, both friends and opponents, if opponents you be, for the extreme kindness with

which you have heard me. I have spoken, and I must speak in very strong terms of the acts done by my opponents. I will never say that they did it from vindictiveness, I will never say that they did it from passion, I will never say that they did it from a sordid love of office; I have no right to use such words; I have no right to entertain such sentiments; I repudiate and abjure them. I give them credit for patriotic motives—I give them credit for those patriotic motives which are incessantly and gratuitously denied to us. I believe we are all united in a fond attachment to the great country to which we belong, to the great empire which has committed to it a trust and function from Providence, as special and remarkable as was ever entrusted to any portion of the family of man. When I speak of that trust and that function I feel that words fail. I cannot tell you what I think of the nobleness of the inheritance which has descended upon us, of the sacredness of the duty of maintaining it. I will not condescend to make it a part of controversial politics. It is a part of my being, of my flesh and blood, of my heart and soul. For those ends I have labored through my youth and manhood, and, more than that, till my hairs are gray. In that faith and practice I have lived, and in that faith and practice I shall die.

